

55

ANSWER

—OF THE—

SHIPPING INTERESTS OF INDIANA

—AND THE—

INDIANAPOLIS FREIGHT BUREAU

—TO—

Remarks of Mr. G. J. Grammer

At Conference held on November 19th, 1906, between
the Indiana Railroad Commission and Special
Committees representing the railroads and
commercial bodies of larger cities of the
State regarding Class Rates in
the State of Indiana

PART I. CLASS RATES IN INDIANA
PART II. INTERSTATE RATES

PART I.

A Statement from the Shipping
Interests of Indiana

2107

LIBRARY
BUREAU OF RAILWAY ECONOMICS

PART I.

A STATEMENT FROM THE SHIPPING INTERESTS OF INDIANA.

In connection with the question of revised class rates in Indiana, which was the subject of discussion in several conferences between railroad officials, State Railroad Commission and representatives of shipping interests, attention is called to the remarks of Mr. G. J. Grammer, speaking for the railroads, on the occasion of the last conference held, November 19th, 1906, attacking the attitude and fairness of the shippers, and which have been printed and are being widely circulated throughout the state. As a speech, prepared for the occasion, if allowed to rest there, no serious or public notice would have been deemed necessary on the part of the shipping interests, but since it has been dressed up and changed for publication by omissions and additions and distributed broadcast in pamphlet form as a campaign document intended to prejudice its readers in regard to existing freight rates, and the frequency with which it charges the shipping interests with bad faith and lack of common sense or honest motives, it becomes necessary and is the duty of the shippers to make a plain and candid reply to that address.

In order that correct understanding of the situation may obtain, it is necessary to briefly review the case and show clearly what led up to these conferences:

Complaints, extending back many months, had been made to the initial roads by interested shippers of Indianapolis regarding the unfairness and inequalities in class rates, requesting that needed adjustments be made in their tariffs. No steps were being taken by the railroads to remedy matters and no indication that anything would be done. Finally notice was given by shippers that the conditions complained of would be presented in an action to be brought before the State Railroad Commission. The interested roads requested that such action be not taken, and asked for a conference with the shippers. This request was complied with and conference was held Oct.

15th, at the office of the Indianapolis Freight Bureau, there being present the traffic officials of the Big Four, Vandalia, L. E. & W. and C., H. & D. Railways. It was admitted by the railroad representatives that class rates not only as affecting Indianapolis but throughout the state, were not properly adjusted and needed revision, and that it was the desire of the roads to adopt a uniform mileage scale of rates on a lower basis than were in effect. Some questions arose of a contingent character and to dispose of such the meeting repaired to the State House, where an interview was had with one of the Commissioners with the result that assurance was given by the railroads that they would arrange for an early meeting of Central Freight Association roads in Indiana to prepare the revised scale of mileage rates above mentioned, and submit same for consideration at another conference to be called.

The second conference was held Oct. 29th, there being present the Commission, a Committee of traffic officials representing the Central Freight Association roads and representatives of shipping interests from various cities and districts of the state. The railroads submitted their revised schedule of rates and to the astonishment of those present representing shipping interests it was disclosed that the figures presented were not in keeping with the promise made at previous conference; they were not on a lower scale, but were actually higher rates for distances up to 70 miles and the same rates for distances over 70 miles that have been in effect on several of the roads for the past 20 years or thereabouts. The proffer of those figures by the railroads seemed to be in bad faith, calculated to precipitate a situation to further and indefinitely delay any adjustment in rates.

The Commission announced the conference adjourned and requested the representatives of the shipping interests present to hold a meeting and prepare a schedule of mileage rates which in their judgment would be fair and reasonable, copies to be furnished the Commission and the railroads, and those figures to be the subject for consideration at a third conference to be called. There were many shipping interests from all parts of the state represented in the meeting, and a committee was appointed to prepare a scale of rates.

The Committee devoted much time and careful consideration to the work, and were guided by reliable data and records in determining upon the essential factors entering into the making of reasonable and fairly remunerative rates, and that there might not be anything hidden or ambiguous in the figures, the schedules as drawn up presented clearly the detail upon which the rates were constructed, showing the factors of terminal and hauling charges; also the percentage adjustment between the several classes. The Committee, realizing the importance of the work, exercised the further care in calling a meeting of all the shipping interests represented at the previous meeting and many additional shippers to consider and pass upon the proposed scale and after careful examination and discussion, the figures and bases were approved.

The third conference was held Nov. 19th, and the proposed schedule of mileage rates presented carried with it the endorsement of a large number of individual shippers, and the commercial bodies of cities throughout the state, who were represented and actively interested and participating in the preparation of the work.

This then brings the matter up to the point where Mr. Grammer appeared and to correctly weigh the fairness of his statements and to locate any element of bad faith appearing in the negotiations, the following facts should be kept in mind:

The railroads asked for the conference.

They acknowledged the rates were wrong.

They promised a reduced scale of rates.

They offered instead an absolutely unfair scale.

That led to request to shippers to prepare a scale.

In opening his address, Mr. Grammer declares he had no greater mission or anything of more importance than to be at the meeting to discuss the proposed rates; yet immediately upon completing the reading of his paper he hurriedly left the room, thereby denying any one present the privilege of interrogating him on any of the remarkable statements and pointed assertions contained in his remarks. Was the conference of no further interest or importance to him after he had his say, or did he deem it wise to avoid annoyance and possible embarrassment in attempting to explain and justify some of the statements made?

The shipping interests were there prepared to explain and justify the fairness of their figures and hear the railroad representatives explain their rates, but the latter would neither discuss their own rates nor those the shippers had to offer. Mr. Grammer declares the shippers of the state are devoid of common sense and actuated by unfair motives in this connection; he tells them, on pages 24 and 25, that present rates are low and they had better enjoy them while they last for it is likely the railroads will advance the rates 10 to 15 per cent. at an early day. Is that statement made in earnest, and does he think the public would submit?

Much of the address is entirely irrelevant to the question under consideration, but let us notice what is presented touching the issue, i. e., class rates in Indiana.

Under the caption, "Exhibit B," a comparison of rates is offered. In this connection it is important to call attention to the fact that in all discussions regarding adjustment in class rates in this territory the railroads fall back on the C. F. A. scale as an argument, when it fits their purpose, especially is that scale referred to on short distances, i. e., 30 miles and under, and Mr. Grammer refers to it, page 12, pointing out that 71 $\frac{1}{2}$ c is the highest rate for 30 miles under the Ohio law; that the Pennsylvania line and other roads in Indiana have published their tariffs accordingly, which have been in effect continuously during the past 20 years, and are in effect today, 71 $\frac{1}{2}$ c first class rate for 30 miles.

In framing his "Exhibit B" referred to, he very adroitly omits a comparison of rates on 30 miles distance. Had he made such a comparison it would show that our proposed 1st class rate for 30 miles is 71 $\frac{1}{2}$ c, the same as published by several of the roads and now in effect. This is important and the omission should not be overlooked or regarded as accidental. It would have injured the purpose and effect of "Exhibit B" to have shown our rate for that particular distance the same as now in effect on a number of the roads. It might even suggest that the shippers are not altogether foolish nor acting in bad faith in proposing for that distance the current rate. Too much weight cannot be given to the importance attaching to the

rate fixed for 30 miles, since it must serve as a key to the whole scale. Once over that distance the roads felt no restraint and were free to fix rates as they pleased, although legal restraint should be exercised over rates for all distances.

Mr. Grammer says, page 14, that our proposed rates for Indiana are 40 per cent. lower than the Ohio Scale. That is not the case. The only scale known as "Ohio Scale" is that governing distances, 30 miles and under, and as pointed out our proposed 1st class rate for 30 miles is $7\frac{1}{2}$ c, which is exactly the rate under the so-called "Ohio Scale," and the same as now in effect on several of the roads in Indiana.

When it is borne in mind that this $7\frac{1}{2}$ c rate, first class for 30 miles, has been the published tariff on several important roads during all these years, certainly the improved commercial conditions of today with the largely increased volume of tonnage, the increased carrying capacity and minimum of cars, and the increased hauling capacity of engines would seem to justify not only the continuance, but a substantial reduction of the rate, and as our proposed scale is based on a graduated ratio of increase according to distance, necessarily the rates for distances under 30 miles are less, as are rates for greater distances proportionately higher.

The only real discussion of our figures by Mr. Grammer is contained in one paragraph—page 11—where he dwells on the 5-mile haul—and cites a \$10,000.00 shipment of silk for that distance. Was this for effect? Does the gentleman know of any such shipment ever moving a total distance of 5 miles in Indiana or any other state? Why limit the argument to silk and for 5-mile hauls. The railroads do not look for sustaining revenue on 5-mile or 10-mile hauls. Take distances approximating a fair average haul, say 40, 50 or 60 miles and note the revenue per ton mile which our figures would yield—as compared with revenue derived from all traffic.

On page 14, Mr. Grammer shows that the Lake Shore, Big Four and Pennsylvania lines freight traffic is carried on rates which yield an average rate per ton mile of about .005, that is 5 mills, or $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per ton per mile. Now refer

to our proposed rates, "Exhibit A" and note the following per ton mile revenue on the basis of those rates:

		Classes: 1 2 3 4 5 6					
miles	per ton mile	20c	18c	18c	12c	12c	8c
0	"	11	10	9	6	6	5
20	"	6.5	6	5.5	3.5	3.5	2.5
30	"	5	4.33	4	2.66	2.66	2
40	"	4.25	3.75	3.5	2.25	2	1.75
50	"	3.9	3.2	3	2	1.8	1.4
60	"	3.5	3	2.66	1.83	1.66	1.33
70	"	3.3	2.8	2.6	1.7	1.6	1.3
75	"	3.2	2.66	2.5	1.7	1.5	1.2
80	"	3.1	2.6	2.4	1.6	1.5	1.1
100	"	2.9	2.4	2.2	1.5	1.3	1.1
120	"	2.75	2.33	2.1	1.4	1.25	1
130	"	2.7	2.2	2	1.4	1.2	1
140	"	2.64	2.2	2	1.36	1.14	.93
150	"	2.6	2.1	1.93	1.33	1.13	.93
200	"	2.2	1.8	1.65	1.15	.93	.8
250	"	1.96	1.6	1.44	1	.84	.68
300	"	1.8	1.46	1.33	.93	.77	.63
350	"	1.68	1.37	1.23	.86	.7	.6

It will be noted that up to 130 miles, which is above the average haul for local freight within the state, the revenue derived does not go below 1 cent per ton mile as against the average earnings on all traffic of 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ c mentioned by Mr. Grammer—and our lowest rate for the greatest distance, 350 miles, yields 6-10 cents per ton per mile. This shows that our lowest proposed rate pays more per ton per mile than the average rate prevailing on the Lake Shore, Big Four and Pennsylvania lines—and it is self evident that an average rate per ton mile under our proposed rates for the several classes would be considerably greater than for the lowest class.

On page 14 it is stated that rates in Indiana are made very low to protect the traffic of the state. Does this mean that the lower basis of class rates from Indianapolis southbound and east bound, within the state, are made for the reason stated—while a much higher scale of rates is maintained west and northbound for similar distances over different divisions of the same roads. Is there any fairness or consistency in such adjustment of rates?

Also on pages 14 and 15 reference is made to the vast tonnage moved from one particular station in Ohio on the Lake Shore Ry.—and from certain two points on the Pennsylvania lines in Ohio—also the tonnage moving from the Pittsburg district. What bearing has all this upon the

question we have under consideration, viz: class rates in Indiana? If Mr. Grammer would state what that large tonnage consists of—it would reveal the fact that such tonnage is not moved on classification rates, but on commodity rates and on lower scale than class rates. So that such statistics need not be introduced to confuse and improperly influence consideration of the only issue under discussion, i. e. local class rates in Indiana.

On page 22 appears the statement that coincident with increase of operating expenses there has been a corresponding decrease in rates. This certainly does not apply to class rates—the subject of this discussion—on the contrary advances were effected by revision of Official Classification issued January 1, 1900, and with the exception of partial recession under Rules 25 and 26, the increases still stand.

The comparisons of rates in other states shown in "Exhibit B" do not necessarily prove anything beyond the fact that class rates in those districts, the same as in Indiana, are held on too high a scale, compared with commodity rates—and when reference is made to the low average rate per ton mile on all traffic mentioned in the address, it only emphasizes the true condition of things—that is that general merchandise and manufactured articles paying class rates are made to bear the burden for the benefit of commodities carried on the low average rates—and it is not apparent why this should be so to such a disproportionate extent. The only tendency towards lower rates has been in commodity tariffs and not in the class rates and this is the situation now presented to the railroads of Indiana. The shippers and receivers in other states will no doubt look after their interests in due time.

On page 25, Mr. Grammer says there is not a railroad in Indiana that earns to exceed its fixed charges on state traffic. The statement is altogether ambiguous as applied to the question under consideration, since it includes a very large tonnage of coal and other commodities which are not carried on classification rates and these various commodity rates covered by special or commodity tariffs, have been very materially reduced during recent years, but classification rates, as covered by class rate tariffs, have not only not been reduced during that period, but have been advanced by changes in classification

as above explained. Further, in this same connection Mr. Grammer appears to speak for all Indiana roads. Can the gentleman state whether or not the accounts of the railroads are so kept as to show separately the revenue derived from freight moving within the state from the total revenues? Has he such figures and will he present them or refer us to the records where such statistics can be found? It would prove to be information of the greatest value to the public and heretofore unobtainable.

On page 26 mention is made of the co-operation necessary between the railroads and patrons. That is good doctrine and that was the sentiment most earnestly expressed by the shippers at that very meeting. It was emphatically stated that every shipper in this state wishes rates established that would show a profit, not a loss, to the railroad companies, and that if the railroads would indicate wherein the rates proposed by the shippers committee would show a loss, they stood ready to change them. But how does the co-operation theory work out in practice? Does not the patron generally secure the short end? Take a situation like the case under discussion, the shipping interests patient and suffering under unjust rates demand relief, the co-operation of interest disappears, the roads resist and refuse the petitions of their patrons, then impugn their motives, charge bad faith, characterize their ideas as absurd without giving figures to prove the assertion, and finally tell them present rates are low enough and more likely to be advanced than reduced. It is just such unyielding and defiant attitude on the part of the railroads which has caused the agitation and produced the many rate makers mentioned on page 18 of the address.

In his speech, page 29, Mr. Grammer says: "We have not come here to say our way is the only way," etc., yet it would be difficult to construe his remarks and actions as a whole in harmony with the expression quoted. Of course the conference failed of agreement and the situation remains unchanged with the railroads charging the high rates complained of and not only no prospect of any voluntary action on their part to relieve conditions, but we are told the present rates may be advanced.

This committee, representing generally the shippers of Indiana, but especially the local shippers throughout

the state was selected at the suggestion and on the request of the Indiana Railroad Commission. Its intelligence has been questioned, its knowledge of the subject has been denied, and even its motives have been impugned. To such "arguments" of assertion and declamation it does not make serious reply.

The committee, simply stands on and pins its faith to a few fundamental propositions, in contending for a reduction of class freight rates throughout Indiana.

First, there has been no reduction in local rates for twenty-five years, while through rates and commodity rates have been substantially reduced.

Second, the development and evolution of the railway business has had the effect to greatly increase the freight carrying capacity of all railroads, without a corresponding increase in the cost of carriage.

Third, the local shippers are the only class patronizing this tremendous business, that has never reaped any benefit from these economic improvements and labor saving processes. The local shipper and the public through him has borne the heaviest burdens of railway discrimination for a quarter of a century. This class has not only paid for its own service, but for all these years it has helped to pay such exorbitant charges as enabled the railroads to give many millions of dollars annually to the powerful and favored shippers of the country. They have been the Peters who have been regularly robbed to pay the Pauls. They have been the victims of the railroad managers one favorite doctrine of the Scriptures: "To him that hath it shall be given, and from him that hath not it shall be taken, even that he seemeth to have." Through all these years it has been the local shipper—the man who paid from \$1.50 to \$2.00 per ton for a five-mile haul—who has been the constant, if compulsory, friend of the railroad, and what is his reward, according to Mr. Grammer? Not only a refusal to lessen his burden but an actual threat to increase it.

On page 18, Mr. Grammer's address in its printed form, reads: "Ninety per cent. of the contention in this country, from its inception and the agitation about rates, has grown up from the efforts of men who were the greatest recipients of favors and have now suddenly become great reformers." The address as delivered would read:

"Ninety-nine per cent. of the contention in this country, from its inception and the agitation about rates, has grown up from the efforts of men who were almost the greatest beneficiaries. I say that without—"

Question. "What do you mean by that?"

Mr. Grammer. "I mean what I say. That the various committees were headed by men who were responsible for these conditions and when they were taken away by the Elkins Law, they suddenly became reformers. I challenge the refutation of that statement. I know what I am talking about, for I paid the bills."

These millions of freight rebates are no longer paid to the favored few. They now remain in the coffers of the railroads. Is it not fair and reasonable—is it any more than common justice—that a portion of these millions be returned to the local shippers in the various states, through a reduction in their freight rates?

To emphasize the correctness of our contention in this respect, we call attention here to statistics furnished by the Inter-State Commerce Commission in its published reports of income account statements from 852 railroads representing an operated mileage of 220,000 miles, being approximately 99 per cent. of the total mileage operated. The report covers the year ending June 30th, 1906:

Gross Earnings for year June 30, 1906,	\$2,319,760,303.00
" " " " " " 30, 1905,	2,082,482,406.00
Average Gross Earnings per mile, 1906,	\$10,543.00
" " " " " " 1905,	9,598.00
Net Earnings for year June 30, 1906,	\$787,596,877.00
" " " " " " 30, 1905,	690,691,151.00
Average Net Earnings per mile, 1906,	\$3,580.00
" " " " " " 1905,	3,183.00
Ratio of Operating Expense to Earnings, 1906,	*66.05
" " " " " " 1905,	*66.78
Dividends paid, year June 30, 1906,	\$229,406,598.00
" " " " " " 30, 1905,	195,157,993.00
Increase in Dividends paid, 1906,	\$34,248,605.00

*Per Cent.

Mr. Grammer says the average rate of freight revenue per ton per mile is only one-half cent. The schedule of rates proposed by this committee carried a higher rate than that for the cheapest class of freight, and of course, the present schedule is much higher. Does that gentleman mean to insist, therefore, that the local shipper must not only pay for his own services, but must pay the losses (if one-half cent is only a fair average return) caused by

the long hauls? If such losses exist—which as a general proposition this committee denies—why should the local shipper pay it all? The answer is plain! Because in local traffic one railroad has a monopoly of the business! The local shipper pays it because he is compelled to. There has heretofore been no escape if he got the service—he must pay it or not ship his stuff.

Now it may be different. Under the auspices and authority of the Indiana Railroad Commission, the railroads can be compelled to deal fairly with this much abused class of its patrons, and to that end, sufficient power should be given to that body by the Legislature to insure such a result.

The shippers' demand is first for equalized or impartial rates, which will insure a fair field and no favor. With equalized rates and no reduction the shippers' interests would not be menaced because they could shoulder the excess charge upon the public. Millions of dollars have been withdrawn from this state and from the people's pockets in just that manner in the past. Therefore, this contest cannot stop with mere equalization of rates. It must go to the point of reduction in rates, based fairly upon the cost of the service performed, so that the people may hereafter receive the practical benefit of the lower rates.

This committee joins with all other shippers' associations and the lovers of fair play generally, in asking the coming Legislature to uphold the hands and strengthen the authority of said commission in the interest of common justice and square deal for all our people.

B. B. JOHNSON,	}	Committee.
Commercial Club, Richmond.		
W. C. ROSTETTER,		
Commercial Club, Fort Wayne.		
GEORGE G. GRIFFIN,	}	
Schnull & Co., Indianapolis.		

J. KEAVY, *Chairman.*

Representing Shipping Interests of Indiana.

PART II.

INDIANAPOLIS FREIGHT BUREAU

IN ANSWER TO

Remarks of Mr. G. J. Grammer

CONCERNING DISCRIMINATORY RATES ON

INTERSTATE TRAFFIC.

PART II.

A STATEMENT FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS FREIGHT BUREAU.

Continuing from Part I of this pamphlet. Mr. G. J. Grammer, vice-president of the N. Y. C. Lines, in speaking on the subject of class rates in Indiana, before the State Railroad Commission at the conference held Nov. 19th, 1906, took occasion to go outside of the questions under consideration and in his overreaching desire to brand everything and everybody connected with the proposition for adjustment and equalization in rates as unfair, unreasonable, acting in bad faith, etc., committed himself to misstatements reflecting upon the attitude and motives of the Indianapolis Freight Bureau which cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged.

We refer to remarks found on pages 27, 28 and 29 of his address where he asserts as evidence of our unfairness and bad faith that we picked out a *few* isolated cases where rates appear to be slightly against Indianapolis, not mentioning the many instances where Indianapolis has lower rates. We would like him to be more explicit and show to us the instances where Indianapolis has lower relative rates than our surrounding competitive cities, and, allowing that some such cases can be shown, is that any sort of argument offsetting our claims for relative rates? We are not asking for any undue advantage over other points; we are seeking adjustments in our rates to a proper relative basis with other points; that is all.

He says we have presented a *few* isolated cases. What does he mean by that statement in the face and full knowledge of the 48 sheets of exhibits which we have so far pre-

sented, showing the most pronounced injustice and discrimination against our shipping interests. To show the disingenuousness in his utterances in this connection we present on the following pages exact copies of our exhibits comprising sheets numbered 1 to 18 inclusive, and our letters accompanying same pointing clearly the palpable discrimination and unwarranted restrictions and hardship imposed upon our traffic.

Careful reading of these exhibits is urged that the shipping public, not only Indianapolis, but throughout the state, may appreciate the handicap they are struggling under against the lower bases of rates in effect from favored localities as clearly shown. The remedying of inequalities complained of on Indianapolis traffic means in a large measure a like adjustment in rates from the other parts of the state--and all are vitally interested.

Following are the exhibits which Mr. Grammer sees fit to describe as a *few isolated cases*:

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:--The attached Sheets Nos. 1, 2 and 3, represent comparisons of rates on various commodities from Chicago and from Indianapolis to Memphis and New Orleans, showing clearly the needs of adjusting Indianapolis rates. We ask for the same relative basis from Indianapolis as applies from Chicago and Ohio River Crossings. In the published class rates to Memphis and New Orleans, the Cincinnati rates apply from Indianapolis, and as noted on enclosed sheets, the rates we ask for are the same as published from Cincinnati.

The rates quoted are shown in C. F. A. Tariff 15 and Mississippi Valley Through Tariff No. 10, and as there would appear to be no grounds for disputing the correctness of the figures we ask for, nor any reason for delay in treating the matter, we will anticipate immediate action on the part of the roads by supplements to the tariffs.

Kindly advise what action will be taken.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 1.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Mississippi Valley Points.

Shooting Powder.	Chgo. to New Orleans, 41c	Rates from Indianapolis should be on basis of 6th class:
C. L.	" " Memphis, 31	
	or 6th class rates.*	
Southern	Indpls. to New Orleans, 54	To New Orleans, 39c
Classification.	" " Memphis, 40	To Memphis, 30
4th class.		Same as from Cincinnati.
<hr/>		
L. C. L.	Chgo. to New Orleans, 58c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
	" " Memphis, 43	
	or 4th class basis.*	
Southern	Indpls. to New Orleans, 75	To New Orleans, 54c
Classification.	" " Memphis, 55	To Memphis, 40
3d class.		Same as from Cincinnati.
<hr/>		
Varnish & Oil.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (any quantity) 35c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
C. L.	Chgo. to Memphis, (any quantity) 27	
	or 6c and 4c below	
Southern	6th class.	Same as from Cincinnati.
Classification.	Indpls. to New Orleans, 54	
4th class.	" " Memphis, 40	
L. C. L.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (any quantity) 35c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
	Chgo. to Memphis, (any quantity) 27	
Southern	or 6c and 4c below	
Classification.	6th class.	
1st, 2d and 3d class.	Indpls. to New Orleans, 98	To New Orleans, 33c
	1st, 83	To Memphis, 26
	2d, 73	Same as from Cincinnati.
	3d, 55	
	Indpls. to Memphis, 75	
	1st, 60	
	2d, 55	
	3d, 55	

*Rates published from Ohio River Crossings are on the basis of 6th and 4th class respectively.

Sheet 2.

To Mississippi Valley Points.

Paints.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (dry or mixed)	26c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
	Chgo. to Memphis, (dry or mixed)	21	To New Orleans, (all kinds), 22c
C. L.	or 15c and 10c below 6th class.		To Memphis, (all kinds), 19
Southern	Indpls. to New Or'ns, dry,	33	Same as from Cincinnati.
Classification,	mixed,	33	
Dry 6th,	Indpls. to Memphis,		
Liquid 5th,	dry,	26	
	mixed,	26	
L. C. L.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (dry or mixed),	35c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
Southern	Chgo. to Memphis, (dry or mixed),	27	To New Orleans, (all kinds), 33c
Classification,	or 6c and 4c below 6th class.		To Memphis, (all kinds), 26
1st, 2d, 4th and 5th class.	Indpls. to New Or'ns,		Same as from Cincinnati.
	1st,	98	
	2d,	83	
	4th,	54	
	5th,	44	
	Indpls. to Memphis,		
	1st,	75	
	2d,	60	
	4th,	40	
	5th,	35	
<hr/>			
Putty.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (any quantity),	35c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
C. L.	Chgo. to Memphis, (any quantity),	27	To New Orleans, 33c
Classification,	or 6c and 4c below 6th class.		To Memphis, 26
5th class,	Indpls. to New Or'ns,	44	Same as from Cincinnati.
	" " Memphis,	35	
L. C. L.	Chgo. to New Orleans, (any quantity),	35c	Same relative basis from Indianapolis would be:
Southern	Chgo. to Memphis, (any quantity),	27	To Memphis, 26c
Classification,	or 6c and 4c below 6th class.		To New Orleans, 33
1st, 2d and 4th class.	Indpls. to New Or'ns,		
	1st,	98	
	2d,	83	
	4th,	54	
	Indpls. to Memphis,		
	1st,	75	
	2d,	65	
	4th,	40	

Sheet 3.
To Mississippi Valley Points.

Saws.	Chgo. to New Orleans, 75c	Same relative basis from
L. C. L.	or 3d class.	Indianapolis would be:
Band or	Indpls. to New Orln's, 83	To New Orleans, 73c
Cross-cut.	or 2d class.	
Crated or boxed,		
Southern		
Classification.		
2d class.		
Saws.	Chgo. to New Orleans, 90c	Same relative basis from
L. C. L.	or 2d class.	Indianapolis should
Buck and	Indpls. to New Orln's,	apply on Circular
Circular.	Circular, 1st class, 98	Saws:
Crated or boxed,	Buck (bx'd.) 2d class 83	To New Orleans, 83c
or on boards.		
Southern		
Classification.		
1st and 2d classes		

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:—Attached hereto are sheets Nos. 4 and 5 showing inequalities in the rates on several commodities from Michigan points to Chicago, Milwaukee, East St. Louis, etc., as compared with rates from Indianapolis, and as we ask only for the same relative basis as authorized by C. F. A. from the Michigan points, we assume there will be no hesitancy in authorizing the rates from Indianapolis as shown in our exhibit.

Kindly advise if the same will be done without delay and oblige.

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 4.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

From Various Michigan Points to C. F. A. Territory.

Chairs.	C. L.	From Detroit,	57c	Indianapolis should have
To St. Paul, Minn.,		Detroit to Chgo.	32	same relative basis to
and Minneapolis,		or 2d class,		Chicago, 2d class, 27c,
Minn.		West,	25	making 52c through to
		Indpls. to Chgo.	34	St. Paul and Minneapolis,
		(Cin. Rate.)		Minn.
		West	25	
		Through,	59	

(Sheet 4 Continued)

Furniture.	From Detroit, Toledo and Bay City.		Rates from Indianapolis should be on same relative basis, viz., 3d class:
Beds: folding	to Chicago,	23 ¹ / ₂ c	
Church Furniture, N. O. S.	To Milwaukee,	27 ¹ / ₂	
Cupboards, wood.	From Grand Rapids, Mich., to Chicago,	21 ¹ / ₂	To Chicago, 21 ¹ / ₂ c
Desks, S. U.	To Milwaukee,	21 ¹ / ₂	To Milwaukee, 25 ¹ / ₂
Furniture, N.O.S.	Basis 3d class.		
Tables, N.O.S.	From Indpls.,		
12,000 lbs	To Chicago,	25	
Official	To Milwaukee,	29	
Classification,	Basis same as from 2d class.		
	Ohio River.		

Furniture.	From Detroit, Toledo and Bay City,		Rates from Indianapolis should be on the basis of 126 per cent. of 4th class, viz.:
Beds: folding	To Chicago,	29c	
Church Furniture, N. O. S.	To Milwaukee,	24	To Chicago, 17 ¹ / ₂ c
Cupboards, wood.	From Grand Rapids, Mich., to Chicago,	17 ¹ / ₂	To Milwaukee, 21
Desks, S. U.	To Milwaukee,	17 ¹ / ₂	
Furniture, N.O.S.	Basis 126 per cent. of 4th class.		
Tables, N. O. S.			
Min. 20,000 lbs.			
Official	From Indpls.,		
Classification,	To Chicago,	25	
2d class.	To Milwaukee,	29	
	Same basis as from Ohio River Crossings.		

Varnish.	Detroit to Chicago,	13c	Indianapolis rate should be on same relative basis, viz., 5th class:
C. L.	" " Danville,	13	
Official	or 5th class.		To Chicago, 11 ¹ / ₂ c
Classification,	Indpls. to Chicago,	14	To Danville, 9 ¹ / ₂
4th class.	" " Danville,	12 ¹ / ₂	

Sheet 5.

From Various Michigan Points to C. F. A. Territory.

Stoves.	From Detroit,		Rates from Indianapolis should be on same relative basis, viz., 6th class:
C. L.	" Toledo,		
Official	To Chicago,	19c	
Classification,	To Milwaukee,	12	To Chicago, 9c
5th class.	or 6th class basis.		To Milwaukee, 11
	Indpls. to Chicago,	11 ¹ / ₂	
	" " Milwaukee,	13 ¹ / ₂	
Radiators.	Detroit to Chicago,	19c	Rates from Indianapolis should be on same relative basis, viz., 6th class:
C. L.	or 6th class.		
Official	Indpls. to Chicago,	11 ¹ / ₂	
Classification,			To Chicago, 9c
5th class.			

(Sheet 5 Continued.)

Woodenware.	From Detroit, Bay	Rates from Indianapolis
C. L.	City, Toledo, etc.,	should be on same rela-
4th class.	To Chicago, 10c	tive basis, viz., 6th
	To E. St. Louis, 17½	class:
	or 6th class basis.	To Chicago, 9
	Indpls. to Chicago, 14	To E. St. Louis, 10½
	" " E. St. Louis 16	

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:—Attached hereto find our sheet No. 6 showing Indianapolis rates to be out of line with published rates in both directions to Chicago and Ohio River crossings. We ask that Indianapolis rates be put on the proper relative basis as shown on enclosed.

Kindly advise us if this will be done without unnecessary delay and oblige.

Very truly yours,

Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 6.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Territory Embraced in Issues of C. & O. R. Committee.

Furniture.	C. L.	Ohio River Crossings,	Indianapolis should have	
Official		To Chicago,	25c same relative basis as	
		To Milwaukee,	29 Ohio River Crossings,	
Classification.		or 3d class rates.	viz., 3d class rates:	
			To Chicago,	21½c
2d class.		From Indpls. same	To Milwaukee,	25½
		rates account inter-		
		mediate.		

Chairs.	C. L.	Ohio River Crossings,	Indianapolis should have
Official		To Chicago,	34c same relative basis, viz.,
	Classification.	To Milwaukee,	39 2d class rates:
1½	any quantity.	or 2d class basis.	To Chicago, 27c
		From Indpls. same	To Milwaukee, 32
		rates account inter-	
		mediate.	

Overalls.	From Ohio River,	Indianapolis should have
Any quantity.	To Chicago,	25c 3d class, 21½c,
Official	or 3d class.	being same relative basis.
Classification.	From Indpls. same	
1st class.	rates account inter-	
	mediate.	

(Sheet 6 Continued.)

Chairs. C. L. To St. Paul, Minn., and Minneapolis, Minn.	From Detroit,	57c	Indianapolis should have same relative basis or 2d class to Chicago, viz.: 27c affecting through rate to St. Paul and Minneap- olis of 52c
	Made to Chicago, or 2d class,	32	
	West,	25	
	Indpls. to St. Paul and Minneapolis,	59	
	Made to Chicago, West,	31 25	
<hr/>			
Dry Goods. Cotton Piece Goods. Any quantity. (For Green Line Territory.)	Chgo. to Ohio River,	17c	Indianapolis should have same relative basis, viz., 4th class, 12½c
	or 4th class. Indpls. to Ohio River,	15	

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:—The attached sheets Nos. 7 and 8 show discrepancies in the current rates from Indianapolis to Ohio River on traffic for Green Line Territory as compared with published rates from East St. Louis. Refer to C. & O. R. Through Freight Rate Basis No. 14, and K. D. No. 615.

Indianapolis interests are entitled to the same relative basis in fixing these proportional rates and ask for such an adjustment as indicated in the exhibit.

We will be pleased to have your views in the matter and advise that this will be done.

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 7.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Green Line Territory.

Furniture. C. L. (When for Green Line Territory.)	From Indpls., min. weight	Indianapolis should have 24,000 lbs., subject to same minimum weight rule 27, Official Classifi- as St. Louis by eliminat- cation, ing Rule 27.
	From St. Louis, min. weight 24,000 lbs.	

(Sheet 7 Continued).

Canned Goods.	From E. St. Louis		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	To Ohio River,	13c	same relative rate,
5th class.	2c below 5th class.		viz.: 7½c
Canned Goods.	From Indpls.		Rate from Indianapolis
L. C. L.	To Ohio River,	9½	should be on same rela-
Southern 3d	From E. St. Louis	15	tive basis, viz., 5th
Official R. 26.	To Ohio River,		class, 9½c
	being 5th class.		
	From Indpls.		
	To Ohio River,	15½	

Fruit Jars and	From E. St. Louis,		Rate from Indianapolis
Jelly Glasses.	To Ohio River,	12c	should be, 6th class, 8c
C. L.	being 6th class.		
5th class.	From Indpls.		
	To Ohio River,	9½	

Window Glass.	From E. St. Louis		Rate from Indianapolis
C. L.	To Ohio River,	13c	should be on same
5th class.	being 2c below 5th		basis, 7½c
	class.		
	From Indpls.		
	To Ohio River,	9½	

Leaf Lard.	From E. St. Louis		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	To Ohio River,	12c	same relative basis,
	6th class basis.		viz., 6th class, 8c
	From Indpls.		
	To Ohio River,	12½c	
	or 4th class basis.		

Sheet 8.

To Green Line Territory.

Fresh Meat.	From E. St. Louis		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	To Ohio River,	15c	same relative basis,
	or 5th class.		viz.,
	When for Carolina		5th class, 9½c
	points,	12	6th class, 8
	or 6th class.		
	From Indpls.		
	To Ohio River,	12½	
	or 4th class.		

Laundry Soap.	From E. St. Louis		Indianapolis should have
Washing Powder.	To Ohio River,	10c	same relative basis,
C. L. and	or 2c below 6th class.		viz., 6c
L. C. L.	From Indpls.		
Southern	To Ohio River,	8	
Classification.	or 6th class.		

(Sheet 8 Continued.)

Stoves.	From E. St. Louis		Same relative basis should apply from Indian- apolis, viz., 7 ¹ / ₂ c and 5c, respectively.
	To Ohio River,	13c	
	5th class,	2c below 5th class.	
	From Indpls.,		
	5th class,	9 ¹ / ₂	
	When for Carolina points:		
	From E. St. Louis		
	To Ohio River,	8	
	4c below 6th class,		
	From Indpls.,		
	To Ohio River,	9 ¹ / ₂	
Stoves.	From E. St. Louis		Rates from Indianapolis should be on same rela- tive basis, viz., 13 ¹ / ₂ c and when for Caro- lina points. 7
	To Ohio River,	19	
	6c under 3d class,		
	From Indpls.,	19 ¹ / ₂	
	3d class,		
	When for Carolina points:		
	From E. St. Louis		
	To Ohio River,	11	
	1c below 6th class,		
	From Indpls.,	19 ¹ / ₂	
	or 3d class,		

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR: We present herewith our sheets Nos. 9, 10 and 11, showing some striking inequalities in the current rates applying on traffic to common points in the southeastern territory from Indianapolis, as compared with published rates from St. Louis, etc., as per K. D. Tariff 615.

The relative rates from Indianapolis which we ask for, as shown on our sheets, are based on the difference in rates north of the river as between East St. Louis and Indianapolis, after deducting the rates beyond Cincinnati from the published through rates from East St. Louis, and which we think is a fair basis in determining the through rates from Indianapolis.

We trust this basis of adjustment will appeal to you as fair to all interests, and will be pleased to hear from you regarding the same. We do not understand why In-

dianapolis interests should be so neglected in fixing and publishing such rates.

Kindly favor us with an early expression and oblige.

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 9.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

To Common Points in Southeastern Territory.

Furniture.	From Indpls. min. weight	Indianapolis should have
C. L.	24,000 lbs., subject to	same minimum weight
	Rule 27, Official Classifi-	basis as St. Louis, viz.,
	cation.	12,000 lbs., Southern
	From St. Louis min.	Classification.
	weight 12,000 lbs, subject	
	to Southern Classificat'n.	

Terra Cotta.	Through rate	Basis for rates from St.
C. L.	From E. St. Louis, 25c	Louis is not apparent but
(for building.)	From Indpls.,	rate from Indianapolis
Southern	To Ohio River, 8	should not be higher
Classification.	South, 20	than from St. Louis,
	Through, 28	viz., 25c

Canned Goods.	Through rate	Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis, 51c	same relative through
5th class.	From Indpls.,	rate, viz., 45½c
	To Ohio River, 9½	5c below 5th class up
	South, 41	to Ohio River.
	Through, 50½	

Canned Goods.	Through rate	Indianapolis should have
L. C. L.	From E. St. Louis, 64c	same relative through
Southern 3d	From Indpls.,	rate, viz., 58½c
Official R. 26.	To Ohio River, 15½	1c below 5th class up
	South, 50	to Ohio River.
	Through, 65½	

Tin Cans.	Through rate	Indianapolis should have
4th class.	From E. St. Louis, 67c	same relative through
	From Indpls.,	rate, viz., 6th class up to
	To Ohio River, 12½	Ohio River.
	South, 55	
	Through, 67½	

Glass Fruit Jars.	Through rate	Indianapolis should have
Jelly Glasses.	From E. St. Louis, 43c	same relative through
5th class.	From Indpls.,	rate, viz., 39c
C. L.	To Ohio River, 9½	4c below 6th class up
	South, 35	to Ohio River.
	Through, 44½	

Sheet 10.

To Common Points in Southeastern Territory.

Window Glass.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	47c	same relative through
5th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 43c
	To Ohio River,	9 ¹ / ₂	6th class up to Ohio
	South,	35	River.
	Through,	14 ¹ / ₂	
Lamp Chimneys.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	76c	same relative through
4th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 70 ¹ / ₂ c
	To Ohio River,	12 ¹ / ₂	1c below 5th class up
	South,	62	to Ohio River.
	Through,	74 ¹ / ₂	
Fresh Meat.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	58c	same relative through
	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 54c
	To Ohio River,	12 ¹ / ₂	1c above 6th class up
	South,	45	to Ohio River.
	Through,	57 ¹ / ₂	
Machinery.	Through rate		Same relative through
Pulleys, C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	44c	rate should apply from
Hangers, C. L.	From Indpls.,		Indianapolis, viz., 40c
Shafting, C. L.	To Ohio River,	8	4c below 6th class up
6th class.	South,	36	to Ohio River.
	Through,	44	
Molasses Syrup.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	32c	same relative through
5th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 30c
	To Ohio River,	9 ¹ / ₂	¹ / ₂ of 6th class to
	South,	26	Ohio River.
	Through,	35 ¹ / ₂	
Molasses Syrup.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
L. C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	36	same relative through
5th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 32c
	To Ohio River,	9 ¹ / ₂	2c below 6th class
	South,	26	to Ohio River.
	Through,	35 ¹ / ₂	

Sheet 11.

Common Points in Southeastern Territory.

Laundry Soap.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	35c	same relative through
6th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 31c
	To Ohio River,	8	5c below 6th class
	South,	28	to Ohio River.
	Through,	36	
Laundry Soap.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
L. C. L.	From E. St. Louis,	45c	same relative through
6th class.	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 41c
	To Ohio River,	8	2c below 6th class
	South,	35	to Ohio River.
	Through,	43	

(Sheet 11 Continued.)

Soap Powders and Washing Compounds. (not liquids) C. L.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
	From E. St. Louis,	35c	same relative through
	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 31c
	To Ohio River,	8	5c below 6th class
	South,	28	to Ohio River.
	Through,	36	
Soap Powders and Washing Compounds. (not liquids) L. C. L.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
	From E. St. Louis,	45	same relative through
	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 41c
	To Ohio River,	8	2c below 6th class to
	South,	35	Ohio River.
	Through,	43	
<hr/>			
Paints, Putty and White Lead. (Any quantity)	Through rate		Same relative through
	From E. St. Louis,	53c	rate should apply from
	From Indpls.,		Indianapolis, viz., 49c
	To Ohio River,	12½	4c below 6th class to
	South,	45	Ohio River.
	Through,	57½	
<hr/>			
Pipe-Wrought Iron. C. L.	Through rate		Indianapolis should have
	From E. St. Louis,	32c	same relative through
	From Indpls.,		rate, viz., 28c
	To Ohio River,	9	5c below 6th class to
	South,	25	Ohio River.
	Through,	34	
<hr/>			
Stoves. C. L.	Through rate		Same relative through
	From E. St. Louis,	43c	rate should apply from
	From Indpls.,		Indianapolis, viz., 39c
	To Ohio River,	9½	4c below 6th class to
	South,	35	Ohio River.
	Through,	41½	

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:—Herewith are our sheets numbered 12 and 13 presenting some comparisons in rates where Indianapolis is very much out of line and we ask that adjustment be made to the proper relative basis as shown on enclosed.

Kindly advise and oblige.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

August 3, 1906.

Sheet 12.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

Between Various Points in C. F. A. Territory.

Bags.	From E. St. Louis,	Same relative basis
Burlap and	To Cincinnati, 20c	should apply from Indi-
Gunny.	To Jeffersonville, 20	anapolis, viz.:
L. C. L.	To New Albany, 20	To Cincinnati, 14½
Official	To Louisville, 20	To Jeffersonville, 14½
Classification	5c under 3d class.	To New Albany, 14½
3d class	From Indianapolis,	To Louisville, 15½
	To Cincinnati, 19½	
	To Jeffersonville, 19½	
	To New Albany, 19½	
	To Louisville, 20½	
<hr/>		
Castings, stove,	From Chicago,	Indianapolis should have
Loose	To E. St. Louis, 10c	same rate as published
C. L.	From Indianapolis,	from Chgo., viz.: Same to
	To E. St. Louis, 13½	apply on castings,
	It is stated Chgo. lines	loose, 10c
	are protecting 8c per cwt.	
	on loose castings.	
<hr/>		
Fresh Meat.	From Chicago,	Indianapolis should have
C. L.	To Detroit, 20c	same rate as from Chgo.,
Exceptions to	3½c less than 3d class.	being practically the
Official	From Indianapolis,	same distance, 20c
Classification.	To Detroit, 24½	
3d class.	or 3d class.	
<hr/>		
Provisions.	From Chicago,	Indianapolis should have
C. L.	To Detroit, Mich., 12c	same rate as from Chgo.,
5th class.	1c under 5th class.	being practically the
	From Indianapolis,	same distance, 12c
	To Detroit, Mich., 14	
	5th class.	

Sheet 13.

Between Various Points in C. F. A. Territory.

Hides. G. S.	From St. Louis,	Rate from Indianapolis
C. L.	To Boyne City,	on same relative basis
5th class.	Mich., 20½c	would be, 15c
	To Cheboygan,	
	Mich., 20½	
	or 5c less than 6th	
	class.	
	From Indianapolis,	
	To Boyne City,	
	Mich., 25	
	To Cheboygan,	
	Mich., 23	
	or 5th class.	

Hides. G. S.	From St. Louis,	Rate from Indianapolis
C. L.	To Holland, Mich., 14½	on same relative basis
5th class.	To Grand Haven, 14½	would be, 12c
	To Muskegon, 14½	
	or 1c below 6th class.	
	From Indianapolis,	
	To Holland, Mich., 15½	
	To Grand Haven, 15½	
	To Muskegon, 15½	
	5th class.	

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR: Under prevailing conditions governing the making of rates to non-prorating points in Mississippi Valley and adjacent territory where combination of rates to and from Memphis, New Orleans, etc., effect the lowest through rates, such combination through rates are authorized from Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, Evansville, St. Louis and all points west of the Indiana-Illinois state line while from Indianapolis, under agreement of the roads, through rates to the territory mentioned must be made by the sums of local rates from Indianapolis to Ohio River Crossings or St. Louis, plus the rates from those points. This, we contend, is wrong both in principle and application to forbid the use of the lower combination from one section while authorizing and permitting the practice from other and favored localities—and having in mind that Indianapolis is intermediate by routes over which the lower basis applies.

Subject to these unfair conditions, Indianapolis is at decided disadvantage in rates to the territory in question. A few comparisons, as shown on attached sheets numbered 14 to 17 inclusive, will serve to illustrate the hardship to our interests.

We ask that the present rule or agreement among the roads be set aside and permit rates to be made from Indianapolis, using the combination on Mississippi Valley points the same as authorized from the other places, all competitive with our interests here; and request that serious consideration be given this subject at the next meeting of your committee and action taken that will present the matter to the Central Freight Association for attention by that body at its next meeting in September.

A copy of this letter is being mailed to the traffic officials of the several Indianapolis roads.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

August 29, 1906.

(Sheet 14, continued.)

To Alexandria, La. Building Paper. C. L.	Published Through Rate.		Combination Rate.	Applying published rate, Indianapolis to New Orleans, C. P. A. Tariff 15, viz.:
	From Chicago (L. Indpls.)	63c		
			From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	26c 22 48
			From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	22 22 44
			From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	8 20 22 50

Sheet 15.

To Schenesport, La. Building Paper. C. L.	Published Through Rate.		Combination Rate.	Applying published rate, Indianapolis to New Orleans as per C. P. A. Tariff 15, viz.:
	From Chicago (Cincli. Indpls.)	63c		
			From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	26c 16 12
			From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	22 16 38
			From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	8 20 16 44

Applying published rate, Indianapolis to New Orleans as per C. P. A. Tariff 15, viz.:

To New Orleans, 22c
Beyond, 16
Through, 38

(Sheet 15, continued.)

To Franklin, La. Paper. C. L. All kinds taking Class A in Southern Classifica- tion, 5th class in Western Classification and 6th class in Official Classification.	Published Through Rate.		Combination Rate.	
	From Chicago) Indpls.) Cinetl		From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, On Class A to New Orleans. From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, Jeffersonville, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	31c 20 51 28 20 48 8 25 20 53
		62c 59c		Applying Class A rates, published from Indianap- olis to New Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15, viz.: To New Orleans, 28c Beyond, 20 Through, 48
To Bowie, La. Structural Iron. C. L.	Published Through Rate.		Combination Rate.	
	From Chicago) Indpls.) Cinetl		From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, Jeffersonville, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	26c 14 40 22 11 36 9 20 14 43
		56c 53		Applying published rates from Indianapolis to New Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15, viz.: To New Orleans, 23c Beyond, 14 Through, 37

Sheet 16.

To Cypress, La. Stoves. C. L.	Published Through Rate. (Chicago) Indpls.) Cinci	Combination Rate.	
		From Chicago,	To New Orleans,
	82c		37c
	79		36
		Through,	73
		From Cincinnati,	
		To New Orleans,	35
		Through,	36
		From Indianapolis,	71
		To Ohio River,	15½
		Cairo,	
		To New Orleans,	26
		Through,	36
			77½

Applying published rates
from Indianapolis to New
Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15,
viz.:
To New Orleans, 35c
Beyond, 36
Through, 71

To
Bankio, La.
Building Paper.
C. L.

To Bankio, La. Building Paper. C. L.	Published Through Rate. (Chicago) Indpls.) Cinci	Combination Rate.	
		From Chicago,	To New Orleans,
	72c		26c
	69		26
		Through,	52
		From Cincinnati,	
		To New Orleans,	22
		Through,	26
		From Indianapolis,	18
		To Ohio River,	13½
		Cairo,	
		To New Orleans,	15
		Through,	26
			54½

Applying published rates
from Indianapolis to New
Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15,
viz.:
To New Orleans, 22c
Beyond, 26
Through, 48

(Sheet 16, continued.)

To Grosse Tete, La. Canned Goods. C. L.	Published Through Rate. From Chicago) Indpls.) Cinet	Combination Rate.	
		From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through, From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, Cairo, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	
	61c		33c
	57		53
			31
			20
			51
			15½
			23
			20
			58½
			31c
			20
			51
			31c
			20
			51

Applying published rates
from Indianapolis to New
Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15,
viz.:

To New Orleans, 31c
Beyond, 20
Through, 51

Sheet 17.

To Iberia, Lat. Woodenware. C. L. 1th class.	Published Through Rate. From Chicago) Cinet.) Indpls.)	Combination Rate	Applying published rates from Indianapolis to New Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15, viz : To New Orleans, 34c Beyond, 23 Through, 57
	From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	36c 23 59	
	From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	34 23 57	
	From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, Cairo, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	18½ 25 23 66½	

24

To Jeanneette, Lat. Castings. C. L. 5th class.	Published Through Rate.		Combination Rate.		Applying published rates from Indianapolis to New Orleans, C. F. A. Tariff 15, viz : To New Orleans, 23c Beyond, 20 Through, 43
	From Chicago) Cinet.) Indpls.)	62c	From Chicago, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	26c 20 46	
			From Cincinnati, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	22 20 42	
			From Indianapolis, To Ohio River, Ohio River, To New Orleans, Beyond, Through,	9 20 20 49	

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee.

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—We desire to call attention to the disparity in rates from Indianapolis as compared with Chicago and Cincinnati to points in Tennessee and Mississippi.

Tariffs carrying through rates are published from Chicago and from Cincinnati, but not from Indianapolis, and our rates through to the territory in question are made on sums of local rates to Ohio River Crossings, plus rates from those points, resulting in much higher rates from Indianapolis than in effect from Chicago and Cincinnati. The enclosed sheets numbered 18 to 21 inclusive present a comparison of some of the rates referred to.

We note the nice alignment preserved throughout in rates from Chicago and Cincinnati and we are certainly entitled to the same relative adjustment, being intermediate, observing Cincinnati rates as maxima from Indianapolis.

We ask that through rates on that basis be shown in Mississippi and Tennessee Junction Tariff No. 3 and other issues which may be published under authority of Central Freight Association roads.

Please bring this subject before the next meeting of your committee that action may be taken to present the matter to the Central Freight Association for consideration of that body at its September meeting.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

August 29, 1906.

Sheet 18.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Interior Points in Tennessee and Mississippi.

Canned Goods	From Chicago	To Indianapolis	From Indianapolis	To Chicago	From Indianapolis	To Indianapolis	Relative basis from Indpls. with Crank rate as maximum.
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	40
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	31
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	39
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	41
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	36
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	39
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	36
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	36
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	40
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	44
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	40
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	39
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	48
Tomato	10	10	10	10	10	10	40

No West of Indianapolis.

Sheet 19.

Specie	From Chicago	To Indianapolis	From Indianapolis	To Chicago	From Indianapolis	To Indianapolis	Relative basis from Indpls. with Crank rate as maximum.
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	37
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	27
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	34
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	33
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	30
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	34
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	30
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	30
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	36
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	43
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	36
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	44
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	45
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	48
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	45
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	48
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	48
Specie	10	10	10	10	10	10	36

No West of Indianapolis.

In a sense of Sheet 19, L. C. L. Rates we have shown 6th
class.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

1999

[illegible]

*Lowest Continuum

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:- Class and commodity rates from Indianapolis are held on a much higher basis than Chicago and Cincinnati on traffic destined to territory in Louisiana, along the Texas & Pacific and Southern Pacific Railways.

From Chicago and Cincinnati the straight New Orleans rates apply to many of the points, and the others take certain arbitraries over New Orleans rates, making in all cases much lower rates than effective from Indianapolis on the present basis, whereby our through rates are made up on locals to Ohio River Crossings plus the rates from those points. Sheets numbered 22, 23 and 24, enclosed herewith, show the inequalities referred to in class rates and on some of the more important commodities. In our exhibit on commodity rates we use Plaquemine, Louisiana, merely as an illustration to show the inequality which applies in like manner to all the other points.

We ask that the existing unjust restrictions be removed and that Indianapolis be given the same basis for through rates to the territory in question as authorized from the other points as shown in exhibits. Our manufacturing and shipping interests are entitled to this—being intermediate—and competition requires that our rates be adjusted to a proper relative basis with other points and districts.

Please submit this subject to your committee at its next meeting that action may be taken to present the matter to the Central Freight Association for consideration at the September meeting of that body.

Copies of this letter are being mailed to traffic officials of the several Indianapolis roads.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

August 30, 1906.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.
To Territory on Texas & Pacific and Southern Pacific Railways in Louisiana.

Class Rates.		To		Texas & Pacific Railway		points:		New Orleans		Rate.	
Bachelor,	La.	From Chicago,		110		90		75		58	
Baton Rouge Jet.,	"	From Cincinnati,		98		83		75		54	
Chamberlain,	"	From Indianapolis,		115		97		82		60½	
Donaldsonville,	"	To Jeffersonville,		25		22				48½	
Glynn,	"	South,		90		75				42½	
Lobdell,	"	Through,		115		97					
Lucerne,	"	To Cairo,						27		18½	
New Roads,	"	South						55		42	
Plaquemine,	"	Through,						82		60½	
Port Allen,	"									48½	
St. Charles,	"									42½	
Torras,	"										
Whitecastle,	"										

29

Class Rates.		From		Relative basis from Indi-	
To points taking arbitra-		Indianapolis		Relative basis from Indi-	
ries over New Orleans		local rates		anapolis would be straight	
rates.		to Ohio River		New Orleans rates plus ar-	
On Texas & Pacific Ry.		plus rate River		bitraries, observing Cin-	
La Fourche Branch.		to New Orleans		cinnati rates as maxima.	
Napoleonville "		plus arbitraries			
Plaquemine		beyond.			
On Southern Pacific Ry.					
Thibodeaux Branch.					

Sheet 23.

Commodity Rates. To Plaquemine, La.	From Chicago. Through tariff		From Cincinnati. Through tariff		From Indpls. *Sums of local rates to Ohio River and beyond.		Relative basis from Indpls. with Cinti. rate as max'm.	
	CL LCL		CL LCL		CL LCL		CL LCL	
	CL	LCL	CL	LCL	CL	LCL	CL	LCL
Baking Powder.....	41	58	39	54	47	69	39	54
Beer,	37		29		36 $\frac{1}{2}$		29	
Canned Goods.....	33	47	31	34	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	55 $\frac{1}{2}$	31	34
Tin Cans	47		44		54 $\frac{1}{2}$		44	
Furniture:								
Beds (iron or brass), Wire								
Mattresses and Cots, Spring								
Beds, Wood Cots and								
Chairs, Metallic Couch								
Frames, Curtain Poles—								
in mixed carloads.....	50		47		62 $\frac{1}{2}$		47	
Kitchen Safes.....	47		44		59 $\frac{1}{2}$		44	
Window Glass	41		36		44 $\frac{1}{2}$		36	
Refrigerators	58	74	54	72	60 $\frac{1}{2}$	82	54	72
Special Iron.....	26	32	29	29	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	29	29
Paints	26		29		36 $\frac{1}{2}$		29	
Paper:								
Roofing and building.....	26		29		35		29	
Starch,	35		33		37		33	
Stoves	37		32		37		33	
Woodenware	36		34		43 $\frac{1}{2}$		34	
Machinery	41		39		44 $\frac{1}{2}$		39	

*Lowest Combination.

Sheet 24.

Commodity Rates. To Napoleonville, La. Machinery. C. L.	From Chicago.		From Cincinnati.		From Indianapolis.		Relative basis from Indpls. with Cinti. rate as maxim.	
	N. Orleans.		N. Orleans.		Ohio River.		Indpls. to	
	41		39		13 $\frac{1}{2}$		N. Or'ns, 39	
To Howell, La. Iron Pipe. C. L.	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	
	Thr'gh, 19	Thr'gh, 47	Thr'gh, 50 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 50 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 50 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 47	Thr'gh, 47	
	31	30	36	36	36	30	30	
To Thibodaux, La. Canned Goods. C. L.	N. Orleans, 26	N. Orleans, 22	N. Orleans, 10	N. Orleans, 10	N. Orleans, 10	N. Orleans, 22	N. Orleans, 22	
	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	N. Or'ns, 18	N. Or'ns, 18	N. Or'ns, 18	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	
	Thr'gh, 31	Thr'gh, 30	Thr'gh, 30	Thr'gh, 30	Thr'gh, 30	Thr'gh, 30	Thr'gh, 30	
To Thibodaux, La. Furniture: Iron beds, cribs, mattresses. In mixed carloads.	41	39	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	39	39	
	N. Orleans, 33	N. Orleans, 31	N. Orleans, 91 $\frac{1}{2}$	N. Orleans, 91 $\frac{1}{2}$	N. Orleans, 91 $\frac{1}{2}$	N. Orleans, 31	N. Orleans, 31	
	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	N. Or'ns, 28	N. Or'ns, 28	N. Or'ns, 28	Arbity, 8	Arbity, 8	
To Thibodaux, La. Furniture: Iron beds, cribs, mattresses. In mixed carloads.	Thr'gh, 41	Thr'gh, 39	Thr'gh, 45 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 45 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 45 $\frac{1}{2}$	Thr'gh, 39	Thr'gh, 39	
	62	59	74	74	74	59	59	
	N. Orleans, 50	N. Orleans, 47	N. Orleans, 27	N. Orleans, 27	N. Orleans, 27	N. Orleans, 47	N. Orleans, 47	
To Thibodaux, La. Furniture: Iron beds, cribs, mattresses. In mixed carloads.	Arbity, 12	Arbity, 12	N. Or'ns, 35	N. Or'ns, 35	N. Or'ns, 35	Arbity, 12	Arbity, 12	
	Thr'gh, 62	Thr'gh, 59	Thr'gh, 74	Thr'gh, 74	Thr'gh, 74	Thr'gh, 59	Thr'gh, 59	

*Secretary Indianapolis Freight Committee,
Indianapolis, Ind.*

DEAR SIR—Replying to your letter of the 18th inst., with reference to our Sheets 4 and 5. We are wholly at loss to understand what is meant by your Committee in asserting that with exception of exhibit presented on chairs, the inequalities shown in ratings on the other commodities treated in these sheets were not serious enough to warrant any charge; also that some of the commodities mentioned are not shipped from Indianapolis. That is a most remarkable statement to emanate from a committee supposed to look after the questions of proper rate adjustments on behalf of industries here, that fair treatment may be accorded in keeping with ratings on our commodities authorized and in effect from competitive points. The only commodity shown on the sheets in question not manufactured and shipped from here is raditors—and that item was included to secure relative rate basis, viz: 6th class in the interests of the Shirley Raditor manufacturers, whose proprietors reside here and are members of this bureau.

We desire to ask the Committee if on furniture from Michigan points where the classification rating of 2nd class is set aside and a commodity rate authorized on a basis of 3rd class, while from Indianapolis the 2nd class rates are charged, they do not regard that as of sufficient importance to make a favorable recommendation for 3rd class from Indianapolis to the same points of destination. Also noticing the second illustration on furniture on basis of 126 per cent. of 4th class from the Michigan districts, while holding Indianapolis to classification basis on 2nd class. Does not this appeal to the Committee as entitled to adjustment in the interests and rights of Indianapolis traffic? Note the differences: Under the first illustration, Bay City to Chicago, 305 miles, $23\frac{1}{2}c$; Detroit to Chicago, 284 miles, $23\frac{1}{2}c$; Toledo to Chicago, 244 miles, $23\frac{1}{2}c$; Grand Rapids, 178 miles, $21\frac{1}{2}c$; Muskegon, 192 and Sparta, 193 miles to Chicago, $21\frac{1}{2}c$; while Indianapolis, 183 miles from Chicago, pays 25c.

Note the second illustration: Rates on furniture to Chicago, from Bay City, Detroit and Toledo, 20c; from Muskegon, Sparta and Grand Rapids, $17\frac{1}{2}c$; while Indianapolis pays 25c.

Our furniture manufacturers will no doubt be much interested to know how the members of the Committee stand on the proposition.

The point involved in the illustrations on Varnish, Stoves, Radiators and Woodenware, the same as on chairs, is that the classification basis has been set aside by agreements among the roads and under authority of Central Freight Association to favor those interests at Toledo and the Michigan districts with lower rates by commodity tariffs, while Indianapolis is held strictly to classification rating; and it matters not whether the difference in rate resulting therefrom be great or small, the principle of right and justice is involved and our interests are entitled to and shall insist upon the same relative rate basis. If from Michigan or other districts commodities are given lower class basis than classification, then Indianapolis must have the same class basis.

It is surprising and deeply disappointing to hear the Committee say these discriminations in classification are of no importance and accordingly refuse to recommend that fairness and justice be done for Indianapolis interests.

On Varnish, Indianapolis is 100 miles shorter distance than Detroit to Chicago, yet we pay higher rate. From Detroit to Danville, Illinois, is 300 miles, the distance from Indianapolis 85, yet we pay $12\frac{1}{2}$ c against Detroit 13c.

On Stoves we pay one class higher than Detroit to Chicago, our rate 5th class, $11\frac{1}{2}$ c, rate from Detroit on 6th class, 10c. Radiators, same conditions as applying on Stoves.

On Woodenware to Chicago, with comparative distances given above, Indianapolis pays 14c, while Bay City, Detroit and Toledo pay 10c. Woodenware to E. St. Louis, distances and rate as follows: Bay City, 585 miles, $17\frac{1}{2}$ c; Detroit, 488 miles, $17\frac{1}{2}$ c; Toledo, 436 miles, $17\frac{1}{2}$ c; while Indianapolis, 242 miles, pays 16c, the difference between 4th class rates charged from Indianapolis and 6th class rates from the other points.

Is it possible the initial carriers at this point would undertake to justify your expressed refusal to remedy such glaring discriminations against these important Indianapolis interests? We believe upon reflection your Committee will reverse its decision completely in this connec-

tion. We are asking only for what is clearly our rights and the Indianapolis Freight Committee is derelict in its duties and responsibilities, alike to the initial roads it represents and the shipping interests of this community, in refusings to act towards correcting the palpable wrongs pointed out on our Sheets 4 and 5.

We hope to hear further and favorably from the Committee in this connection.

Very truly yours

.....
Commissioner.

Oct. 22, 1906.

Secretary Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—Replying to your letter of Oct. 18th, with reference to our Sheets Nos. 14 to 17, inclusive, treating the question of rates to non-prorating points in Mississippi Valley and adjacent territory; also our Sheets 18 to 20, inclusive, relative to rates to interior junction points in Tennessee and Mississippi.

We beg to impress upon the Committee that their views are entirely in error in proposing Chicago rates as basis from Indianapolis to the territory in question. By no just nor competent reasoning can any such conclusions be sustained and we protest strongly against that sort of adjustment. Sheets 14 to 17, 18 to 21 and 22 to 24, inclusive, although covered by different tariff issues, describe three parts of one general territory to the west of Green Line or Southeastern Territory and east of the Mississippi River, excepting Texas and Pacific and Southern Pacific Railway points, and in the matter of fixing a rate basis for Indianapolis to that whole section we beg to call attention to the fact that a basis already exists and has long been established, i. e., the published class rates from Cincinnati as maxima from Indianapolis to Mississippi Valley prorating points, and we want that basis recognized and used in fixing all rates, class and commodity, to that whole territory. In the last paragraph of your letter you state our Sheets 22, 23 and 24 have been approved without any alteration, which is the adoption of Cincinnati rates as maxima from Indianapolis, and that is the only

correct treatment to give to adjustments asked under our Sheets 14 to 17 and 18 to 21, and not to do so would be altogether inconsistent with the Committee's action on Sheets 22, 23 and 24, since the general situation and rate conditions as between Chicago and Cincinnati are the same throughout. You will observe that on the commodities shown in all the sheets, 14 to 24, Cincinnati rates generally are 2c and 1c below Chicago, and so with the class rates excepting 1st and 2nd classes.

We trust we have made this clear; that a solution for one is the solution for all contained in Sheets 14 to 24, inclusive, and that the Committee will reconsider the matter and recommend Cincinnati rates as maximum basis for Indianapolis to territory described in our Sheets 14 to 24, inclusive. Will expect to hear further from you advising the Committee's action in response to above.

Very truly yours

.....
Commissioner.

Oct. 22, 1906.

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—We are in receipt of several letters dated Oct. 18th, from Secretary Barr, advising the action taken by your Committee on some of our Exhibits of Comparative Rates; also regarding some of the special subjects presented by the Bureau.

Enclosed are copies of letters in reply to Mr. Barr's communications where it appears the Committee's action is in error and insufficient to do justice to our propositions.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding and to enable your Committee to fully comprehend the significance of our Exhibits, Sheets 1 to 24, inclusive, will state that under Sheets 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 we present specific cases and ask for exactly the same basis of rating on the commodities named, to the same points of destination or basing points, i. e., where interests at other points are favored to the extent of setting aside the classi-

fication rating and by commodity tariff or otherwise the carriers make rates on the basis of one or two or three classes lower than classification, or 1c, 2c, 3c, 4c or 5c below the proper class rate; then we shall insist that the same concessions be made for Indianapolis traffic.

All the other sheets, viz.: 1, 2, 3, 14 to 17, 18 to 21, 22 to 24, inclusive, point to inequalities operating against Indianapolis in the several tariff issues covering the territories described in the heading of our Exhibits, and the adjustments called for involve the full scope of these tariffs and extent of territory and all rates, class or commodity, carried in each tariff. That is to say, the instances or comparisons set forth in our sheets are presented only as illustrations, reflecting the conditions of the entire tariff or tariffs applying to all of the commodities or class rates to all points embraced in the territories described and covered by such tariffs, and not merely the particular cases used for illustrations.

For your further information and understanding of the situation and our attitude and demands for a complete revision and readjustment of Indianapolis rates, we enclose next attached copy of letter addressed to the traffic officials of the several Indianapolis roads, also summary accompanying same setting forth specifically the adjustments called for in connection with each of our several Exhibits, Sheets 1 to 24.

Our members, realizing the flagrant discriminations existing against Indianapolis traffic, are insistent upon having full justice done in the readjustment of our rate situations and merely partial or half-way measures of relief or indifference on the part of the Committee acting for the initial carriers, as indicated by Secretary Barr's letter of the 18th dealing with some of the propositions, will be resented and contested by the Bureau.

We trust your Committee will in fairness admit the correctness of our contention and do justice to our interests here in recommending for radical and complete readjustment in Indianapolis rates and conditions applying to our traffic.

Very truly yours

.....

Commissioner.

Oct. 23, 1906.

General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the many propositions, our Sheets Nos. 1 to 24, inclusive, presented by this Bureau to the Indianapolis Committee, copies of which have been furnished to the traffic officials of the several Indianapolis roads, calling for adjustment in our rate situations. We have by our exhibits clearly established the fact that Indianapolis traffic destined in every direction excepting east-bound is subjected to excessive and unwarranted rates relatively to the rates in effect from surrounding competitive cities.

We show that respectively rates from Chicago, Cincinnati, and from E. St. Louis to Mississippi Valley points, to territory known as Interior Mississippi and Tennessee junction points, to Green Line Territory and Southeastern common points, effective over routes passing through Indianapolis, are made and in effect without any regard to Indianapolis interests, alignment of rates, law or reason, and in many instances these rates are less than rates from Indianapolis. See our Sheets Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 to 11, inclusive.

We show that from the Michigan districts on carload shipments to principal and basing points, furniture, woodenware, varnish, chairs and stoves, all important commodities in Indianapolis traffic, are given rates on lower basis than official classification while holding our traffic in these commodities strictly to classification.

Furniture from Michigan has 3rd class, from Indianapolis 2nd class.

Woodenware from Michigan, 6th class; from Indianapolis 4th class.

Varnish from Detroit, 5th class; from Indianapolis, 4th class.

Chairs from Michigan points, 2nd class; from Indianapolis, 4½ class.

Stoves from Detroit, 6th class; from Indianapolis, 5th class.

See our Sheets Nos. 4 and 5.

We show that from Chicago to Detroit Fresh Meat and Provisions are rated 3½¢ and 1¢, respectively, below classification basis, while from Indianapolis the classification rating is enforced representing differences in rates

per cwt. against Indianapolis of $4\frac{1}{2}c$ on the former and $2c$ on the latter with distance practically the same. Our Sheet No. 12.

We show that on Hides to tannery points in Michigan, St. Louis has rates $5c$ below 6th class, while Indianapolis shipments pay the classification rating of 5th class, representing an excess in rate of $8c$ per cwt. on Indianapolis traffic. Our Sheet No. 13.

We show that on traffic destined to non-prorating points in Mississippi Valley and adjacent territory by arbitrary ruling and agreement among the roads, Indianapolis is held on a higher and excessive basis in effecting through rates than authorized and applied from Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, New Albany, Evansville, St. Louis and all points west of the Indiana-Illinois state line. Our Sheets Nos. 14 to 17, inclusive.

We show that through tariff rates are published on traffic from Chicago and Cincinnati to points in Tennessee and Mississippi, while Indianapolis has to effect through rates by sums of local rates to Ohio River crossings and local rates beyond, resulting in much higher rates than should obtain on proper basis for relative through tariff rates. The traffic from Chicago and Cincinnati under this showing passes through Indianapolis. Our Sheets Nos. 18 to 21, inclusive.

We show that on traffic destined to territory on Texas Pacific and Southern Pacific Railways in Louisiana, both Chicago and Cincinnati have lower rates, class and commodities, than permitted from Indianapolis, by reason of the unwarranted restrictions imposed upon Indianapolis and territory east of the Indiana-Illinois state line, but not applied on traffic from Cincinnati, which, as well as Chicago traffic, passes through Indianapolis. Our Sheets Nos. 22, 23 and 24.

The adjustments as called for by our exhibits referred to in the foregoing are as indicated on attached sheet. Our members desire to have an explicit expression from you at this time announcing your attitude towards these propositions. We presented all these matters to you, as well as to the Indianapolis Committee, during August, and should have had relief at Central Freight Association meetings in September, and it is important that we know in advance

if the situation is to be remedied by action of that body at its November meetings.

Kindly favor us with early reply and oblige,

Very truly yours

.....
Commissioner.

Oct. 19, 1906.

ADJUSTMENTS IN RATES REQUIRED IN THE INTERESTS OF
INDIANAPOLIS TRAFFIC, AS PER EXHIBITS, SHEETS
Nos. 1 TO 24, INCLUSIVE.

1st.—To Mississippi Valley Points, Sheets 1, 2 and 3:

Cincinnati rates on all commodities, being the same basis as carried in class rates.

2nd.—Various commodity rating between C. F. A. points, Sheets 4 and 5:

The same relative class basis from Indianapolis on the commodities and to the destination points as shown in the exhibit.

3rd.—C. & O. R. Committee issues, Sheet No. 6:

The same relative class basis from Indianapolis on the commodities and to the destination points as shown in the exhibit.

4th.—To Green Line Territory, proportional rates to Ohio River; Sheets 7 and 8:

The same relative basis as to class rates and minimum weights on the commodities as shown in the exhibit.

5th.—To common points in Southeastern Territory, Sheets 9, 10 and 11:

The same relative basis as to class rates to Ohio River as per exhibit; or if through divisions are used from E. St. Louis, relative through rates from Indianapolis on percentage basis less than E. St. Louis.

6th.—Miscellaneous commodity rates between C. F. A. points; Sheets 12 and 13:

The same relative basis as to class rates from Indianapolis on commodities named and to destination points as shown in exhibit.

7th.—To non-prorating points in Mississippi Valley; Sheets 14 to 17, inclusive:

That on traffic from Indianapolis the combination of rates to and from Memphis, New Orleans, etc., be permit-

ted and authorized same as in effect from Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, New Albany, Evansville, St. Louis, etc., as illustrated in exhibit.

8th.—To interior Tennessee and Mississippi points; Sheets 18 to 21, inclusive:

That through rates be shown from Indianapolis in published tariffs, observing Cincinnati rates as maxima as described in exhibit.

9th.—To territory on Texas & Pacific and Southern Pacific Railways in Louisiana; Sheets 22, 23 and 24:

That on traffic from Indianapolis the same basis for through rates be permitted and authorized as in effect from Chicago, Cincinnati, etc., holding Cincinnati rates as maxima as illustrated in exhibit.

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee.

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—We wish to direct the attention of your committee to the matter of furniture rates from Indianapolis to Missouri River points as compared with the commodity rates from Chicago and Louisville as illustrated by exhibit attached herewith—our sheet 25.

The distance from Chicago to Kansas City, as we figure, short mileage, is 458 miles, while the distance from Indianapolis to Kansas City is 492 miles.

The average distance from Chicago to the five Missouri River points: Omaha, St. Joseph, Leavenworth, Atchison and Kansas City, by short lines, is about 485 miles, taking C. & N. W. to Omaha, C. B. & Q. to St. Joseph, Leavenworth and Atchison and the Santa Fe to Kansas City. The average distance from Indianapolis to the same points is about 520 miles, as follows: to Kansas City via Decatur and Wabash; to Atchison, Leavenworth and St. Joseph via Decatur, Wabash and C. B. & Q. and to Omaha via Peoria and C. B. & Q. The distance from Louisville to Kansas City is 550 miles, as against 492 miles from Indianapolis, and the average distance from Louisville to the five points named is 595 miles.

The exhibit shows the freight charged on the different kinds of furniture as described in Lists Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, also at different minimum weights—and at a glance you

will see the palpable injustice of the rates charged from Indianapolis; the differences, taking cars of 40 feet to 50 feet in length, generally used for furniture shipments, being \$15.00 to \$39.00 per car in favor of Louisville and from \$25.00 to \$49.00 per car in favor of Chicago on furniture N. O. S. as per List No. 1.

There is no justice nor even argument for lower rates from Louisville than from Indianapolis to the territory in question. Neither is there any justification, distance considered, for allowing Chicago such advantage in the rates as against Indianapolis. Our interests here cannot endure such discrimination and ask for immediate relief. As a temporary adjustment we request that the through rates to Missouri River points, Kansas City to Omaha inclusive, on furniture, carloads, 20,000 lbs. minimum from Indianapolis, be fixed on the basis of 5c per cwt. over the Chicago rate by authorizing differentials to the Mississippi River or otherwise--making a through rate of 35c per cwt. This rate to be applied as maximum to intermediate territory, also as basis for territory beyond. The rate from Louisville referred to in the exhibit is carried in Southern Railway Tariff L. C. C. 802, and the rates from Chicago are as set forth in the Book of Western Freight Rates No. 5.

Please get this subject before your committee for action without delay and advise, obliging.

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

Oct. 27, 1906.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Missouri River Crossings and Intermediate Points.

List No. 1.	From Chicago.		From Louisville.		To		From Indianapolis		Differences per car
	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Miss River.	Miss Rte. Chge.	Beyond	Th'gh Chge.	
36-ft. Car.....	20000	30 60.00	20000	35 70.00	10000	32 32.00	20000	22.5 45.00	77.00
40-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	12500	" 40.00	"	"	85.00
45-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	16500	" 52.80	"	"	97.80
50-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	18000	" 57.60	"	"	102.60
On 20000-lb. load.					20000	" 64.00	"	"	109.00

List No. 2.	From Chicago.		From Louisville.		To		From Indianapolis		Differences per car
	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Miss River.	Miss Rte. Chge.	Beyond	Th'gh Chge.	
36-ft. Car.....	20000	30 60.00	20000	35 70.00	12000	23.5 28.20	20000	22.5 45.00	73.20
40-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	15000	" 35.25	"	"	80.25
45-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	19800	" 46.13	"	"	91.43
50-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	21600	" 50.76	"	"	95.76
On 20000-lb. load.					20000	" 47.00	"	"	92.00

List No. 3.	From Chicago.		From Louisville.		To		From Indianapolis		Differences per car
	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Min.	Rte. Chge.	Miss River.	Miss Rte. Chge.	Beyond	Th'gh Chge.	
36-ft. Car.....	20000	30 60.00	20000	35 70.00	18000	16 28.80	20000	22.5 45.00	73.80
40-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	22500	" 36.00	"	"	81.00
45-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	29700	" 47.52	"	"	92.52
50-ft. ".....	"	"	"	"	32400	" 51.84	"	"	96.84
On 20000-lb. load.					20000	" 32.00	"	"	77.00

List No. 1—Furniture, new, N.O.S.	List No. 2—Kitchen Cabinets, C. L.	List No. 3—Spring Beds, Metal	Conch Frames, Metallic Mattress- es, Cots and Cribs.	Points to which rates apply— Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Neb.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Atchinson, Kan.; Leavenworth, Kan., and intermedi- ate points.	Tariff Authorities. Southern Railway, W. T. L., Exceptions to Official Class'n. Vandalia, 2549. C.C.C. & St. L., 147-A	C-802, 201.

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Dear Sir:—The enclosed exhibits—our sheet 32—present comparison of Indianapolis and Chicago rates to Missouri River points and territory beyond in Missouri and Kansas as per lists of point attached hereto on furniture of different kinds described in Lists Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4.

These figures show differences in rates in favor of Chicago as follows: Articles named in List No. 1, $24\frac{1}{2}$ c per cwt.; List No. 2, 16c per cwt.; List No. 3, $8\frac{1}{2}$ c per cwt. and List No. 4, 6c per cwt. You will note the same differences in rates against Indianapolis holds out in all the groups owing to the adjustment in rates from Chicago and from Mississippi River. List No. 1 includes furniture N. O. S., showing a difference of $24\frac{1}{2}$ c per cwt. against Indianapolis.

This arrangement of rates is altogether unreasonable and untenable and calls for a prompt and fair adjustment by the initial carriers at Indianapolis and which our interests here expect to be done without unnecessary delay.

To show further how pronounced this discrimination is against Indianapolis we submit some additional comparisons on Sheets 26, 27 and 28 enclosed herewith, giving furniture ratings from Michigan points to the territory in question, showing that Grand Rapids has from 14.00 to \$17.00 per car less than Indianapolis, Benton Harbor \$17.00 to \$22.00 less per car, Detroit and Toledo \$9.00 to \$15.00 per car less freight to pay than Indianapolis. Such a condition is outrageous and ought not to be suffered to continue, and it is earnestly hoped your committee will appreciate the seriousness of the situation and give immediate attention to the subject, recommending proper adjustment.

Inasmuch as the same conditions are presented in this proposition as govern in connection with our exhibit, as per Sheet 25, being the rate from Chicago to the terri-

tory and points named, we ask for the same measure of relief, viz: that through rates on furniture, all kinds, car-load, 20,000 lbs., Indianapolis to the territory and points named, be established on the basis of 5c per cwt. above the rates from Chicago.

Kindly secure early action of your committee and advise what is done, obliging.

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

Oct. 29, 1906.

Sheet 26.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.
Furniture Rates to Missouri River Territory and Beyond.

To Group	From Indianapolis			From Grand Rapids, Mich.			In favor of Indpls. Grand over Rpls.
	Miss. River.	Miss. River to Destination.	Ttl. Chge.	Min. Rte. Chge.	To Chicago.	Ttl. Chge.	
1.							
36-ft. Car.	10000	32 32.00	20000	22.5 45.00	77.00		
10-ft. " "	12500	" 40.00	"	" 85.00			
15-ft. " "	16500	" 52.80	"	" 97.80			
50-ft. " "	18000	" 57.60	"	" 102.60			
On 20000 lb Load	" 64.00	" "	" 109.00				
				126 per cent.			
				1 class 20000	17.5 35.00	" " "	95.00
							14.00

The above exhibit covers:

Folding Beds,)	The rates from Chicago and Mississippi River to points in
Church Furniture, N. O. S.,)	Groups 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 carry the same differences and the
Cupboards, wooden,)	same relative differences as shown prevail to all the Groups.
Desks, S. O.,)	
Furniture, N. O. S. (except chairs))	
Tables, N. O. S.,)	

Sheet 27.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Furniture Rates to Missouri River Territory and Beyond.

[illegible]

The above exhibit covers:

The rates from Chicago and Mississippi River to points in Groups 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 carry the same relative differences and the same differences as shown prevail to all the Groups.

Sheet 28.
COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.
Furniture Rates to Missouri River Territory and Beyond.

To Group	From Indianapolis			From Benton Harbor, Mich.			in favor of	
	To Miss. River, Min. Rte, Chgo.	Miss. River to Destination.	Ttl. Chgo.	Class'n Basis from Michgn. Terry.	To Chicago, Min. Rte, Chgo.	Chicago to Destination.	Indpls. Butn over Harb.	Butn over Indpls.
L.								
36 ft. Cut....	10000	32 32.00	20000	22.5	15.00	77.00		
40 ft. "	12500	" "	" "	" "	" "	85.00		
45 ft. "	16500	" "	" "	" "	" "	97.80		1.60
50 ft. "	18000	" "	" "	" "	" "	102.60		17.40
On 20000 lb Load	"	"	"	126 per cent.	"	"	"	22.20
The above exhibit covers:				4 class 20000	15 30.00	"	"	19.00
Folding Beds,						"	"	
Church Furniture, N. O. S.,)							
Cupboards, wooden,)							
Desks, S. T.,) C. L.							
Furniture, N. O. S. (except chairs))							
Tables, N. O. S.)							

The rates from Chicago and Mississippi River to points in Groups 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 carry the same relative differences and the differences as shown prevail to all the Groups.

Sheet 32.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Rates on Furniture to Missouri River Territory and Beyond.

To	Through	Indpls.	Rates	Through	Difference
	Rate	to	from	Rate	in favor
GROUP I.	from	Miss.	Miss.	from	of
Chicago.	Indpls.	River.	River.	Indpls.	Chicago.
List No. 1.....	30c	32c	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ c	54 $\frac{1}{2}$ c	24 $\frac{1}{2}$ c
" " 2.....	30	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	46	16
" " 3.....	30	16	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	30	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	36	6
To					
GROUP II.					
List No. 1.....	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	32	24	56	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 2.....	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	24	47 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
" " 3.....	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	24	40	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	24	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
To					
GROUP III.					
List No. 1.....	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	32	25	57	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 2.....	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	25	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
" " 3.....	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	25	41	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	25	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
To					
GROUP IV.					
List No. 1.....	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	32	30	62	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 2.....	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	30	53 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
" " 3.....	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	30	46	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	30	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
To					
GROUP V.					
List No. 1.....	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	32	35	67	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 2.....	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	35	58 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
" " 3.....	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	35	51	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	35	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
To					
GROUP VI.					
List No. 1.....	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	32	38	70	24 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 2.....	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	38	61 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
" " 3.....	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	38	54	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " 4.....	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	38	51 $\frac{1}{2}$	6

List No. 1—Furniture, N. O. S. Tariff Authorities—
 List No. 2—Kitchen Cabinets. Western Book Tariff No. 5.
 List No. 3—Spring Beds, Woven Western Book Tariff from
 Wire Mattresses, Mississippi River.
 Woven Wire Cots Exceptions—
 and Metallic Mat- Vandalia 2549, CCC 447-A,
 tresses. covering Lists 2 and 3.
 List No. 4—Iron Beds.

Groups Referred to in Exhibit Sheets Nos. 26, 27, 28 and 32.

Group I.

Adrian	Mo.	Pecley	Kas.	Monteith Jet.	Mo.
Aldrich	"	Foster	"	Montrese	"
Appleton City	"	Freeman	"	Mt. Washington	"
Archie	"	Garden City	"	Nevada	"
Arthur	"	Gowdy	"	Nichols	"
Athol	"	Grand View	"	Norths	"
Arora	"	Greenwood	"	Ore	"
Avon	"	Handley	"	Ovid	"
Barton	"	Harlan	"	Panama	"
Belvidere	"	Harrisonville	"	Passa	"
Blairstown	"	Harrelson	"	Peculiar	"
Bever	"	Heartwell	"	Pleasant Hill	"
Brownington	"	Harvey	"	Post Oak	"
Buttler	"	Harwood	"	Quick City	"
Byrl	"	Heins	"	Raymore	"
Calhoun	"	Holden	"	Richards	"
Cecil	"	Horns	"	Rich Hill	"
Chadwick	"	Wharton	"	Rock Creek	"
Chillowwe	"	Huber	"	Rockville	"
Clinton	"	Humansville	"	Sheffield	"
Coburg	Kas.	Jeffreys	"	South Lee	"
Coleman	"	Kansas City Jet.	"	Springfield	"
Collings	"	Kimpton	Mo.	Sweat Park	"
Creighton	"	Latour	"	Urich	"
Daugherty	"	Leeds	"	Wales	"
Deep Water	"	Lees Summit	"	Walkeis	"
Deerfield	"	Leeton	"	Walnut Grove	"
Diamond	"	Levy	"	Winchell	"
Delton	"	Little Blue	"	Windsor	"
Dodson	"	Lone Tree	"		
Dunnegan	"	Lowry City	"		
East Lynn	"	Magnolia	"		
Ellis	"	Maurine	"		
Elm Park	"	Maywood	"		
Eudora	"	Metz	"		
Fair Play	"	Mile	"		

Group II.

Amerot	Mo.	Godfrey	Kas.	Neutral	Kas.
Amos	"	Golden City	Mo.	Ocheltree	"
Amsterdam	"	Ganby	"	Olathe	"
Arma	Kas.	Greenfield	"	Olds	"
Asbury	Mo.	Groom	Kas.	Opolis	"
Ash Grove	"	Fulfton	"	Oronogo	Mo.
Asylum Spur	Kas.	Hammond	"	Oskaloosa	"
Baxter	"	Haunen	"	Pennsboro	"
Bentley	"	Hillsdale	"	Phenix	"
Blosscourt	"	Hume	Mo.	Pieton	Kas.
Bois d'Arc	Mo.	Iantha	"	Pilgrim	"
Bonita	Kas.	Independence	"	Pittsburg	"
Boston	Mo.	Irwin	"	Pleasanton	"
Bronaugh	"	Jasper	"	Prescott	"
Bruce	Kas.	Jandon	"	Red Bridge	Mo.
Bucyrus	"	Jewett	Kas.	Rex	"
Carbon Center	Mo.	Joplin	"	Richards	"

Carl Junction	Mo.	Keith	Mo.	Rinehart	Mo.
Carthage	"	Kenoma	"	Rosedale	Kas.
Cartersville	"	Kniveton	Kas.	Saginaw	Mo.
Carytown	"	Lackamana	"	Scammon	Kas.
Cherokee	Kas.	La Cygno	"	Scott Junction	"
Chiles	"	Lamar	Mo.	Seligman	Mo.
Cleveland	Mo.	Last Chance	"	Smithfield	"
Coalvale	Kas.	Monexa	Kas.	Somerset	"
Columbus	"	Lento	"	South Greenfield	"
Cornell	"	Liberal	Mo.	Sprague	Mo.
Crestline	"	Linton	Kas.	Spring Hill	Kas.
Drexel	Mo.	Lisle	Mo.	Stanley	"
Drywood	Kas.	Lockwood	"	Stilwell	"
Edwin	Mo.	Loneoak	Kas.	Stotesbury	Mo.
Elliott	"	Lone Tree	"	Swarts	"
Elwood	"	Louisburg	"	Thomas	"
Emmet	"	Macy	"	Tipton Ford	"
Empire	Kas.	Mackie	"	Tuckahoe	"
Englevale	"	Mansuer	"	Turek	Kas.
Eve	Mo.	Martin City	"	Varek	"
Everton	"	Mastin	"	Waco	"
Farlington	Kas.	Marriam	"	Wagstaff	"
Felming	"	Minden	Mo.	Ward	Mo.
Fontana	"	Midway	Kas.	Washburn	Kas.
Fort Scott	"	Miller	Mo.	Webb City	"
Frontonac	"	Mokan	"	West Belton	Mo.
Fuller	"	Morse	Kas.	West Line	"
Fulton	"	Mt. Vernon	Mo.	Worland	"
Galena	"	Mulberry	"	Yale	Kas.
Garland	"	Nelson	Kas.		
Girard	"	Noosho	Mo.		

Group III.

Anderson	Mo.	Gentry	Ark.	Mine Wonders	Mo.
Avoca	Ark.	Goodman	Mo.	Noel	"
Bentonville	"	Gravette	Ark.	Osborne	Ark.
Centerton	"	Hiwasee	"	Rogers	"
Decatur	"	Lanagan	Mo.	Siloam Springs	"
Eldorado Springs	Mo.	McElhany	"	Sulphur Springs	"
Garfield	Ark.	Madge	"	Wye	Mo.

Group IV.

Chanute	Kas.	Gretna	Mo.	Oswego	Kas.
Chetopa	"	Humboldt	Kas.	Ottawa	"
Colony	"	Iola	"	Selma	"
Erie	"	Kincan	"	Trilby	"
Garnett	"	La Harpe	"	Wainut	"
Gas	"	Moran	"		

Group V.

Benedict	Kas.	Independence	Kas.	Nodesha	Kas.
Cherryvale	"	Le Roy Jct.	"	Piqua	"
Coffeyville	"	Moody	"	Yates Center	"
		Mound Valley	"		

Group VI.

Melva	Mo.
-------	-----

*Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,
Indianapolis, Ind.*

DEAR SIR:—We invite attention to the enclosed exhibit—our Sheets Nos. 29, 30 and 31, showing comparison in rates on Chairs C. L. from Indianapolis with our strong competitive points, Chicago, Louisville, Grand Rapids and Detroit, to Missouri River territory. We would have you note particularly the fact that our natural and direct route via Mississippi River is closed to us on this business and the traffic is forced to move via Chicago to effect lower rates by using the Cincinnati rates of 2nd-class as intermediate.

The exhibit shows that on a 40-ft. car, Indianapolis pays \$85.50 to the Missouri River, while Chicago pays \$43.00, Louisville \$70.00, Grand Rapids \$76.75, Detroit \$83.00 and on a 50-ft. car, Indianapolis pays \$115.00, Chicago \$54.00, Louisville \$70.00, Grand Rapids \$103.00, Detroit \$112.00; while on 20,000 lb. minimum, Indianapolis pays \$128.00, Chicago \$60.00, Louisville \$70.00, Grand Rapids \$114.00 and Detroit \$124.00 per car. In other words, while our distance is practically the same as Chicago, Indianapolis has to pay \$68.00 per car more freight—and with 75 miles less average distance than Louisville to Missouri River points, we pay \$58.00 per car more—Grand Rapids, with distance about 150 miles greater, enjoys \$14.00 per car less freight and Detroit with 220 miles greater distance has a less rate than Indianapolis.

This certainly is a bad piece of rate work and our interests here call upon the initial carriers at Indianapolis to remedy the situation without delay, which can be done easily enough by establishing a through rate on the basis of 5c per cwt. over Chicago rate, which is 32c, making Indianapolis 37c to Missouri River points, under Western Classification, minimum as follows: 36-ft. car, 12,000 lbs.—40-ft. car, 13,440 lbs.—45-ft. car, 15,240 lbs.—50-ft. car, 17,040 lbs., observing as a maximum basis, the Chicago rate of 30c at 20,000 lbs., as shown in exhibit—this being the rate on furniture, all kinds, thus making the maximum charge from Indianapolis 35c at 20,000 lbs. minimum. We suggest the above basis as a temporary adjustment and of course want the rate to apply over the direct route via Mississippi River and as mentioned in connec-

tion with our exhibit on furniture, Sheet 25, the adoption of a basis of differentials, Indianapolis to the Mississippi River, seems to offer a practicable solution. Our chair manufacturers cannot compete against such odds and as the rates are so radically unjust we trust immediate action will be taken to correct the same and fix Indianapolis rates on the proper relative basis with the other points as outlined above.

Please get this before your Committee for consideration and recommendation, advising your action, and oblige
Very truly yours,

Oct. 27, 1906.

Commissioner.

Sheet 29.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Chairs, C. L.—Cane, Wood or Veneer Seat—in Bds., Crates or Boxes. To Missouri River Crossings and Intermediate Territory.

—FROM INDIANAPOLIS—

To Miss. River.					Beyond.			
	Min.	Rate.	Chge.		Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot Car.....Any Qty.	55.5		*55.50	12000	x27	32.40		87.90
40-foot "	"	"	*69.37	13440	"	36.28		105.65
45-foot "	"	"	*91.58	15240	"	41.15		132.73
50-foot "	"	"	*99.90	20000	z22.5	45.00		144.90
20000-lb. Load..	"	"	111.00	20000	"	45.00		156.00

To Chicago.

	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot Car.....	10000	634	34.00	12000	x32	38.40	72.40
40-foot "	12500	"	42.50	13440	"	43.00	85.00
45-foot "	16500	"	56.10	15240	"	48.76	104.86
50-foot "	18000	"	61.20	17040	"	54.52	115.72
20000-lb. Load....	"	"	68.00	20000	z30	60.00	128.00

—FROM GRAND RAPIDS—

To Chicago.				Beyond.			
	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot Car.....	10000	27	27.00	12000	x32	38.40	65.40
40-foot "	12500	"	33.75	13440	"	43.00	76.75
45-foot "	16500	"	44.55	15240	"	48.76	93.31
50-foot "	18000	"	48.60	17040	"	54.52	103.12
20000-lb. Load....	"	"	54.00	20000	z30	60.00	114.00

o—Cinti. Rate C & OR 48 W. TL 201.

*Same minimum as used

via Chgo. x—Using 4th class rate.

z—Using Commodity rate.

Differences via E. St. Louis
in favor Chicago and Grand
Rapids as against Indpls.

Differences via Chicago
in favor Chicago and Grand
Rapids as against Indpls.

	Chgo.	Gr. Rpd.
36-ft. Car,	49.50	22.50
40 " "	62.65	28.90
45 " "	83.97	39.42
50 " "	90.38	41.78
20000-lb load	96.00	42.00

	Chgo.	Gr. Rpd.
36-ft. Car,	34.00	7.00
40 " "	42.50	8.75
45 " "	56.10	11.55
50 " "	61.20	12.60
20000-lb load	68.00	14.00

Sheet 30.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Chairs, C. L.—Cane, Wood or Veneer Seat—in Bdls., Crates or Boxes.

To Missouri River Crossings and Intermediate Territory.

—FROM INDIANAPOLIS—									
To Miss. River.					Beyond.				
		Min.	Rate.	Chge.		Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot	Car.....Any Qty.		55.5	*55.50		12000	x27	32.40	87.90
40-foot	"....."		"	*69.37		13440	"	36.28	105.65
45-foot	"....."		"	*91.58		15240	"	41.15	132.73
50-foot	"....."		"	*99.90		20000	z22.5	45.00	144.90
20000-lb.	Load....			111.00		20000	"	45.00	156.00

To Chicago.					Beyond.				
		Min.	Rate.	Chge.		Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot Car.	10000	o31	34.00		12000	x32	38.40	72.40
40-foot "	12500	"	42.50		13440	"	43.00	85.00
45-foot "	16500	"	56.10		15240	"	48.76	104.86
50-foot "	18000	"	61.20		17040	"	54.52	115.72
20000-lb. Load.		"	68.00		20000	z30	60.00	128.00

—FROM DETROIT—								
		To Chicago.			Beyond.			
		Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.
36-foot	Car.....	10000	32	32.00	12000	32	38.40	70.40
40-foot	"	12500	"	40.00	13440	"	43.00	83.00
45-foot	"	16500	"	52.80	15240	"	48.76	101.56
50-foot	"	18000	"	57.60	17040	"	54.52	112.12
20000-lb.	Load....		"	64.00	20000	30	60.00	124.00

o—Cinti. Rate C & OR 48 W. TL 201. *Same minimum as used
via Chgo. x—Using 1th class rate. z—Using Commodity rate.

Differences via E. St. Louis
in favor of Chicago and De-
troit as against Indianapolis.
Chgo. Detroit.

36-ft. Car.	19.50	47.50
40 "	62.65	22.65
45 "	83.97	31.17
50 "	90.38	32.78
20000-lb load	96.00	52.00

Differences via Chicago
in favor of Chicago and De-
troit as against Indianapolis.

	Chgo.	Detroit.
36-ft. Car.	34.00	2.00
40 "	42.50	2.50
45 "	56.10	3.30
50 "	61.20	3.60
20000-lb load	68.00	4.00

Sheet 31.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Chairs, C. L.—Cane. Wood or Veneer Seat—in Bdls., Crates or Boxes.
To Missouri River Crossings and Intermediate Territory.

—FROM INDIANAPOLIS—								
To Miss. River.				Beyond.				
	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.	
36-foot Car.....Any Qty.		55.5	*55.50	12000	x27	32.40	87.90	
40-foot "....."		"	*69.37	13440	"	36.28	105.65	
45-foot "....."		"	*91.58	15240	"	41.15	132.73	
50-foot "....."		"	*99.90	20000	z22.5	45.00	144.90	
20000-lb. Load.....		"	111.00	20000	"	45.00	156.00	

To Chicago.				Beyond.				
	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Min.	Rate.	Chge.	Thro.	
36-foot Car.....	10000	o34	34.00	12000	x32	38.40	72.40	
40-foot ".....	12500	"	42.50	13440	"	43.00	85.00	
45-foot ".....	16500	"	56.10	15240	"	48.76	104.86	
50-foot ".....	18000	"	61.20	17040	"	54.52	115.72	
20000-lb. Load....		"	68.00	20000	z30	60.00	128.00	

—FROM LOUISVILLE—			
	Min.	Rate.	Chge.
36-foot Car.....	20000	s35	70.00
40-foot ".....	"	"	"
45-foot ".....	"	"	"
50-foot ".....	"	"	"
20000-lb. Load....		"	"

o—Cinti. Rate C & OR 48 W. TL. 201. *Same minimum as used
via Chgo. x—Using 4th class rate. z—Using Commodity rate.
s—Kansas City rate as maximum; Sou. Ry. Tariff C-802.

Differences via E. St. Louis
in favor of Chicago and Louis-
ville as against Indpls.

Differences via Chicago
in favor of Chicago and Louis-
ville as against Indpls.

	Chgo.	Louisv.
36-ft. Car.	49.50	27.90
40 " "	62.65	35.65
45 " "	83.97	62.73
50 " "	90.38	74.90
20000-lb load	96.00	86.00

	Chgo.	Louisv.
36-ft. Car.	34.00	2.40
40 " "	42.50	15.50
45 " "	56.10	34.86
50 " "	61.20	45.72
20000-lb load	68.00	58.00

*Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,
Indianapolis, Ind.*

DEAR SIR:—We desire to call attention to class and commodity rates to Indian and Oklahoma Territories as carried in I. & O. Commodity Tariff 1-II, and request that amendment to the same be made fixing Indianapolis rates on a proper relative basis which, considering distance, should not be higher than rates from Chicago. See enclosed exhibit, our Sheets 33 to 40, inclusive, and 45 and 46.

The present adjustment applies Cincinnati rates to Indianapolis as intermediate, but this is not satisfactory nor is it a fair basis, since the mileage from Indianapolis and Chicago to that territory is practically the same as follows, taking a central point in either territory: Chicago to McAlester, I. T., 774 miles, from Indianapolis, 808; from Cincinnati, 902. Chicago to Oklahoma City, 802 miles; from Indianapolis, 785; from Cincinnati, 879. Average distance from Chicago, 784 miles; from Indianapolis, 796; from Cincinnati, 890. Indianapolis is shortest mileage to Oklahoma, and but 12 miles longer average distance than Chicago, while Cincinnati is 100 miles longer on average distance shown. We note the class rates from St. Paul are 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, Class A, 2c above Chicago, and on the commodities shown in the tariff referred to St. Paul rates are on a basis of class differentials over the Chicago rates.

If to meet our views it is necessary to re-arrange the so-called defined territory, then we ask that this be done. There is no good reason why Indianapolis traffic should bear the same rates as Cincinnati to the territory in question and absolutely no fairness nor justice in making rates from St. Paul on a lower basis than charged from Indianapolis.

In this connection and referring to the same tariff, we point to quite a number of commodity rates, shown on

pages 123 and 131, and in supplements which include the following: Canned goods, Coffee, Furniture, Iron and Steel Articles, Stoves and Woodenware, which are all important commodities in Indianapolis traffic and on which appears reduced rates from Chicago and St. Paul, making the differences in rates against Indianapolis all the more pronounced as shown by our exhibit.

Please have this subject considered without delay by your Committee and proper recommendation made for the adjustment above requested, viz.: the application of the Chicago rates from Indianapolis. Kindly advise your action and very much oblige,

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

Oct. 27, 1906.

Sheet 33.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Canned Goods. C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
C. R. I. & P. Ry. Caston to				
McAlester,	48	49	55	48
M. K. & T. Ry. Vinita to				
McAlester,	48	49	55	48
Mo. Pacific Ry. Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	48	49	55	48
M. O. & G. Ry. Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	48	49	55	48
St. L. & S. F. Ry. Vinita to				
Muskogee,	48	49	55	48

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 611.

Sheet 34.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Coffee. C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
C. R. I. & P. Ry. Caston to				
McAlester,	55	56	x67	55
M. K. & T. Ry. Rentiesville to				
McAlester,	55	56	x67	55
x5th class, Midland Valley Ry.				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
M. K. & T. Ry. Vinita to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
Mo. Pacific Ry. Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	48	49	67	48
M. O. & G. Ry. Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
St. L. & S. F. Ry. Vinita to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 612.

Sheet 35.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Furniture, New. N. O. S.

Kitchen Cabinets, C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
Midland Valley Ry. Muskogee,	59½	61½	83	59½
M. K. & T. Ry. Russell Creek to				
Muskogee,	59½	61½	83	59½
Mo. Pacific Ry. Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	59½	61½	83	59½
M. O. & G. Ry. Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	59½	61½	83	59½
St. L. & S. F. Ry. Wyandotte to				
Muskogee,	59½	61½	83	59½

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 613.

Sheet 36.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Iron and Steel Articles. C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
C. R. I. & P. Ry.				
Caston to				
McAlester,	48	49	57	48
Midland Valley Ry.				
Muskogee,	48	49	57	48
M. K. & T. Ry.				
Vinita to				
McAlester,	48	49	57	48
Mo. Pacific Ry.				
Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	48	49	57	48
M. O. & G. Ry.				
Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	48	49	57	48
St. L. & S. F. Ry.				
Vinita to				
Claremore,)				
Ft. Gibson,)	48	49	57	48
Muskogee,)				

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 614.

Sheet 37.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Stoves. C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
C. R. I. & P. Ry.				
Caston to				
McAlester,	55	56	67	55
M. K. & T. Ry.				
Rentiesville to				
McAlester,	55	56	67	55
Midland Valley Ry.				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
M. K. & T. Ry.				
Vinita to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
Mo. Pacific Ry.				
Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	48	49	67	48
M. O. & G. Ry.				
Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48
St. L. & S. F. Ry.				
Vinita to				
Muskogee,	48	49	67	48

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 616.

Sheet 38.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Points in Indian Territory.

Woodenware. C. L.

To—	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Indianapolis should take Chgo. rates.
A. T. & S. F. Ry. Tulsa,	61	66	80	64
Midland Valley Ry. Tulsa to				
Muskogee,	61	66	80	64
M. K. & T. Ry. Vinita to				
Muskogee,	61	66	80	64
Mo. Pacific Ry. Polston to				
Ft. Gibson,	64	66	80	64
M. O. & G. Ry. Wagoner to				
Muskogee,	64	66	80	64
St. L. & S. F. Ry. Vinita to				
Muskogee,	64	66	80	64
C. R. I. & P. Ry. Caston to				
McAlester,	69	71	80	69
M. K. & T. Ry. Oak-ta-ha to				
McAlester,	69	71	80	69

*Applies from Indianapolis as intermediate.

I. & O. C. Committee Tariff 1-H, Supplement 4, Item 617.

Sheet 39.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

Class Rates to Indian Territory and Oklahoma.

To Vinita, I. T.	1	2	3	4	5	A
From St. Louis.....	105	83	73	55	43	45
Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
Through Rate from Chicago.....	125	103	83	60	48	52½
St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
Through Rate from St. Paul.....	130	107	86	62	49	54½
Rate from Indianapolis:						
(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	148	124	102	85	67	74
To Muskogee I. T.						
Ft. Gibson, " "						
Wagoner, " "						
Claremore, " "						
From St. Louis.....	115	100	80	64	48	51
Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
Through Rate from Chicago.....	135	120	90	69	53	58½
St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
Through Rate from St. Paul.....	138	124	93	71	54	60½
Rate from Indianapolis:						
(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	148	124	102	85	67	74
To McAlester, I. T.—						
From St. Louis.....	120	100	85	69	55	57
Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
Through Rate from Chicago.....	140	120	95	74	60	64½
St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
Through Rate from St. Paul.....	145	124	98	76	61	66½
Rate from Indianapolis:						
(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	148	124	102	85	67	74

Sheet 40.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Class Rates to Indian Territory and Oklahoma.

To	Newkirk, O. T.—	1	2	3	4	5	A
	From St. Louis.....	126	104	88	72	60	60
	Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
	Through Rate from Chicago.....	146	124	98	77	65	67½
	St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
	Through Rate from St. Paul.....	151	128	101	79	66	69½
	Rate from Indianapolis:						
	(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	150	129	109	94	74	74
To	Pawnee, O. T.—						
	From St. Louis.....	128	106	93	78	64	63
	Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
	Through Rate from Chicago.....	148	126	103	83	69	70½
	St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
	Through Rate from St. Paul.....	153	130	106	85	70	72½
	Rate from Indianapolis:						
	(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	150	129	109	94	74	74
To	Chandler, O. T.						
	Guthrie, " "						
	Oklahoma City, " "						
	From St. Louis.....	130	109	97	84	67	65
	Chicago Differentials over St. Louis	20	20	10	5	5	7½
	Through Rate from Chicago.....	150	129	107	89	72	72½
	St. Paul Differentials over Chicago	5	4	3	2	1	2
	Through Rate from St. Paul.....	155	133	110	91	73	74½
	Rate from Indianapolis:						
	(Cincinnati Territory Rate).....	150	129	109	94	74	74

Sheet 45.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Commodity Rates to Indian Territory and Oklahoma.

Commodity, C. L.	Rate from St. Louis.	Rate from Chgo.	Rate from St. Paul.	*Rate from Cincti. Ter'ty.	Indpls. should have Chgo. Rate.
Bagging, clayed,	70	75	76	77	75
Beer,	48	53	54	55	53
Canned Goods,	48	53	54	55	53
Cotton Piece Goods, (any qnty.)	113	128	133	133	128
Electric Machinery,	79	86½	88½	88	86½
Beds, iron and brass,					
Springs Beds,					
Metallic Couch Frames,	53	58	59	65	58
Metallic Mattresses,	x58	x63	x64	65	63
Metallic Cots and Cribs,					
Iron Beds,	49	54	55	61	54
	x54	x59	x60	61	59
Iron and Steel Articles,	50	55	56	57	55
Structural Iron,	50	55	56	57	55
Jelly,)					
Preserves,)					
Fruit Butter,)	49	54	55	56	54
Mince Meat,)					
Packing House Products,	x60	x65	x66	x67	x65
Paints,	55	60	61	62	60
Paper, (mixed C. L.)	75	80	81	82	80
Paper, wrapping,	55	60	61	62	60
Roofing and Building Paper)	54	59	61	61	59
Roofing Cement,)					
Stoves, (Air-tight heaters)	96	101	103	106	101
Stoves and Stove Furniture,	60	65	66	67	65
Tin Articles,	75	80	82	85	80
Vehicles,	74	81½	83½	83	81½
Woodenware,	70	75	77	80	75

*Applies from Indpls. as intermediate.

xTo Group 5 points.

I & O. Conference Committee Tariff 1-H.

Sheet 46.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Special Commodity Rates to Indian Territory.

Machinery, C. L. for use of coal mines.		* Indianapolis Rate from sh'd have Cincinnati Chicago Territory. Rate.		
To—	Rate from St. Louis.	Rate from Chicago.	Rate from Cincinnati Territory.	Rate.
C. R. I. & P. Ry.—				
Alderson,	42c	49½c	74c	49½c
Baker,	"	"	"	"
Coalgate,	"	"	83	"
Craig,	"	"	"	"
Donnan,	"	"	74	"
Edwards,	"	"	83	"
Haileyville,	"	"	74	"
Hartshorne,	"	"	"	"
Hughes,	"	"	"	"
Lutie,	"	"	74	"
Shaft No. 3,	"	"	"	"
McAlester,	"	"	"	"
Milburton,	"	"	"	"
Ft. S. & W. Ry.—				
Bokoshe,	"	"	"	"
Featherston,	"	"	"	"
McCurtain,	"	"	"	"
Midland Valley Ry.—				
Bokoshe,	"	"	"	"
Maney,	"	"	"	"
Stigler,	"	"	"	"
M. K. & T. Ry.—				
Carbon,	"	"	"	"
Chambers,	"	"	83	"
Coalgate,	"	"	"	"
Drum,	"	"	74	"
Savana,	"	"	83	"
Johnsville,	"	"	"	"
Krebs,	"	"	74	"
Lehigh,	"	"	83	"
McAlester,	"	"	74	"
Midway,	"	"	83	"
No. McAlester,	"	"	74	"
Wilburton,	"	"	74	"
M. O. & G. Ry.—				
Henryetta,	"	"	"	"
St. L. & S. F. Ry.—				
Cameron,	"	"	74	"
Caston,	"	"	"	"
Catoosa,	"	"	"	"
Cavanal,	"	"	"	"
Chelsea,	"	"	"	"
Claremore,	"	"	"	"
Dawson,	"	"	"	"
Sequoyah,	"	"	74	"
Tulsa,	"	"	"	"
Tulsa, (A. T. & S. F. Ry.)	"	"	74	"

* Applies for Indpls. as intermediate.

I. & O. Com. Tariff 1-H, items 384 and 385.

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—Please refer to Arkansas Freight Committee Tariff No. 1-H and Territorial Directory 1-D, naming rates to Arkansas common points, under the differential basis applied from Chicago-Cincinnati territory. We call your attention to the fact that on certain commodities the differentials are not applicable on shipments originating east of the Indiana-Illinois state line, which traffic must pay local rates to East St. Louis; these include vehicles, furniture, woodenware and chairs, all being important factors in Indianapolis traffic; however, this restriction on the commodities named is waived in so far as Cincinnati, Louisville, New Albany, Evansville, also Chicago are concerned, and the traffic from those points is moved on the basis of differentials to East St. Louis. In other words, Indianapolis interests are ignored and our traffic shut out from the territory in question. The enclosed exhibit, our Sheets 41 and 42, illustrate how severely this hardship works out in its application to our manufacturing and shipping interests.

Noticing the exhibit on vehicles, Chicago and Cincinnati get to East St. Louis for 9c per cwt., Louisville for 4c while Indianapolis pays 16c.

On woodenware Louisville is charged 5c, Cincinnati and Chicago 10c, while Indianapolis pays 16c. Bay City, Detroit and Toledo pay but 20c and Grand Rapids 19c.

On furniture Louisville pays 4c, Chicago and Cincinnati 9c, while Indianapolis pays 32c. Detroit gets there for 32½c and Grand Rapids for 30½c.

On chairs Louisville is charged 5c, Chicago and Cincinnati 8c, while Indianapolis pays 55½c. Detroit pays but 42c and Grand Rapids 37c.

Such an arrangement of rates is so utterly unreasonable and unjust and discrimination so palpable in enforcing arbitrary restrictions of this kind that we deem it un-

necessary to go into any argument, and merely make known to you that we shall expect the initial carriers at Indianapolis to see to it that immediate action is taken to remove these disabilities and give Indianapolis traffic the same favorable and free conditions to work under as enjoyed by our competitive manufacturing and shipping centers.

Please get this before your Committee for early consideration and recommendation for our relief by authorizing the use of differentials on all commodities from Indianapolis, advising what action is taken and oblige,

Very truly yours,

Commissioner.

Oct. 27, 1906.

Sheet 41.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

To Arkansas Common Points.

Furniture, C. L.	Rate.	Basis.
Grand Rapids to Chicago,	21½c	Commodity 3rd-class.
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	9	Class A Differential.
Grand Rapids to E. St. Louis,	30½	
Detroit to Chicago,	23½c	Commodity 3rd-class.
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	9	Class A Differential.
Detroit to E. St. Louis,	32½	
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	9c	Class A Differential.
Cincinnati to E. St. Louis,	9	" " "
Louisville to E. St. Louis,	4	" " "
Indianapolis to E. St. Louis,	32	2nd-class.

Tariff Authorities—

Arkansas Freight Committee Tariff 1-H.

L. S. & M. S. A-1698.

Chairs, Cane, Wood or Veneer Seat, C. L.		
Grand Rapids to Chicago,	27c	Commodity 2nd-class.
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	8	Class B Differential.
Grand Rapids to E. St. Louis,	35	
Detroit to Chicago,	32c	Commodity 2nd-class.
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	8	Class B Differential.
Detroit to E. St. Louis,	40	
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	8	Class B Differential.
Cincinnati to E. St. Louis,	8	" " "
Louisville to E. St. Louis,	3	" " "
Indianapolis to E. St. Louis,	55½	No carload rating.
		1½ any quantity.

Tariff Authorities—

Arkansas Freight Committee Tariff 1-H.

L. S. & M. S. A-1698.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

To Arkansas Common Points.		
Woodenware, C. L.	Rate.	Basis.
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	10c	4th-class Differential.
Cincinnati to E. St. Louis,	10	" " "
Louisville to E. St. Louis,	5	" " "
Indianapolis to E. St. Louis,	16	4th-class local rate.
Tariff Authorities—		
Arkansas Freight Committee Tariff 1-H.		
Vehicles, C. L.		
Chicago to E. St. Louis,	9c	Class A Differential.
Cincinnati to E. St. Louis,	9	" " "
Louisville to E. St. Louis,	4	" " "
Indianapolis to E. St. Louis,	16	4th-class.
Tariff Authorities—		
Arkansas Freight Committee Tariff 1-H.		
C. C. C. & St. L. 447-A 212.		
Vandalia, 2549	1905.	

*Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,
Indianapolis, Ind.*

DEAR SIR:—Please note enclosed exhibit, our Sheet 43, showing rating on chairs, carloads, to St. Louis proper, from Grand Rapids at 50c, Detroit 55c, Louisville 35c, while Indianapolis pays 58½c.

The rates from Grand Rapids and Detroit under C. F. A. authority are on the basis of 2nd-class rate to Chicago, and we are entitled to the same consideration and ask that carload rating on chairs, Indianapolis to St. Louis, be authorized on the basis of 2d-class, 34c per cwt., and urge that this be done without delay. Our interests are suffering under the present unjust arrangement of rates, and should have immediate relief.

Please have this subject considered by your Committee at the earliest date possible, and recommending the adjustment asked for, advising your action and oblige,

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

Oct, 29, 1906.

**COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.**

To St. Louis, Missouri.

Chairs, Cane, Wood or Veneer Seat, C. L.	Rate.	Basis.
Grand Rapids to Chicago,	27c	Commodity 2nd-class.
Chicago to St. Louis,	23	" 1th "
Through,	50	
Detroit to Chicago,	32c	Commodity 2nd-class.
Chicago to St. Louis,	23	" 1th "
Through,	55	
Louisville (Ky.) to St. Louis,	*35c	Kansas City rate.
Indianapolis to St. Louis,	58½	No carload rating. 1½ any quantity.

*Southern Ry. Tariff C-802.

Kansas City rate as maximum.

Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,

Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR:—We call your attention to enclosed exhibit, our Sheet No. 11, showing discrepancy in current rates on furniture as specified, C. L., when destined to interior Kentucky and Tennessee points.

Note that on shipments from St. Louis the 4th-class 17c per cwt., applies as proportional rate, E. St. Louis to Ohio River Crossings, while Indianapolis pays classification rate, 2nd-class, 22c per cwt. On the minimum weight prescribed, viz.: 18000 lbs., our shippers have to pay \$9.00 per car more freight, and on a 20000-lb load \$10.00 more per car than the same traffic from St. Louis. The distances are: E. St. Louis to Louisville, 271 miles, and to Cincinnati 336, while from Indianapolis is 110 miles to either point. We ask for the same basis as in effect from St. Louis, viz.: 4th-class, as proportional rate to the Ohio River Crossings, which would be 12½c from Indianapolis.

Please have this considered by your Committee, trusting there will be no opposition to recommending favorably to the Central Freight Association at the November meetings for the relief asked, advising the action of your Committee,

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

Sheet 44.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING
AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Interior Kentucky and Tennessee Points.

Furniture, C. L. as specified:

Beds, iron;

Spring Beds, compressed;

Metallic Mattresses, Cots and Cribs.

From

E. St. Louis

From

Indianapolis

To

Cincinnati, Louisville, Jefferson-
ville and New Albany.

Minimum any length car.	Rate 4th-class Basis.	Charge.	Weight.	Rate 2nd-class Basis.	Charge.	Difference in favor of East St. Louis.
18000 lbs.	17c	\$30.60	18000	22c	\$39.60	\$ 9.00
20000 lbs.	17	34.00	20000	22	44.00	10.00
Tariff Authorities.			Distance.			Miles.
St. Louis, Cincinnati, Louisville			E. St. Louis to Cincinnati,			336
Freight Committee B-50, Amend-			" " " " Louisville,			271
ment No. 1.			Indianapolis to Cincinnati,			110
C. & O. R. 48.			" " " " Louisville,			110

*Chairman Indianapolis Freight Committee,**Indianapolis, Ind.*

DEAR SIR:—We present herewith exhibit, our Sheets 47 and 48, showing the hardship imposed upon Indianapolis traffic destined to Texas and Arkansas common points, on certain commodities where part car lots in excess of full carloads are charged at L. C. L. rates, while similar shipments of same commodities from Chicago, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Louisville and other competitive cities are taken applying the carload rating on such part lots.

The through carload rates within the minimum weights prescribed are the same on Texas traffic from Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Chicago and Milwaukee, and on all traffic to Arkansas points excepting the restricted commodities as to differentials, the basis is the same. Note the exhibit, on vehicles to Texas, shipments with part lots weighing 3000 lbs., 4000 lbs. and 5000 lbs., respectively.

Indianapolis pays \$44.25, \$59.00 and \$73.75 more freight than exactly similar shipments made from Chicago, Milwaukee and Cincinnati via routes passing through Indianapolis, and still greater differences in favor of Louisville. Again, note the exhibit for Arkansas points on shipments of vehicles from Indianapolis with part lots weighing 3000 lbs., 4000 lbs. and 5000 lbs., respectively, our shippers pay \$56.50, \$57.70 and \$59.00 more freight than the same traffic would be charged from Cincinnati, Chicago or Milwaukee; and Louisville, with a lower through rate, has still greater advantage against Indianapolis. Note particularly that from Indianapolis to Arkansas points a part lot weighing 5000 lbs. is charged as much as a full carload, and the total freight on the shipment equals two full carloads.

Other light and bulky commodities are affected in like manner and while the restriction complained of is not enforced against same traffic from the other points it means an advantage deliberately given to the trade of favored cities and districts over Indianapolis expressed in dollars and cents, as shown in exhibit, and is clearly a pronounced discrimination against our interests.

Competitive traffic cannot bear such unequal and unjust conditions imposed arbitrarily by the railroads upon some localities and not upon others, and our people insist that the disability be removed and permit Indianapolis shipments to move under the same conditions as does traffic from the other competitive cities mentioned. We look to the initial carriers at this point to protect our interests and urge immediate action in affording the relief asked for in this connection, and authorizing the application of carload rating on part car lots on all commodities so treated from other points.

Please have this subject considered without delay and referred to Central Freight Association with recommendation for action by that body at its November meetings, advising us the action of your Committee, obliging,

Very truly yours,

.....

Commissioner.

Oct. 27, 1906.

Sheet 47.

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

To Texas Common Points.		Vehicles—Part car lots in excess of full carloads.				In favor of Cinti. Chgo. Mil. as against Indpls.	
From Cincinnati, Chicago,) Milwaukee,)		—36-ft. Car—		—10-ft. Car—		—15-ft. Car—	
		Wght.	Rte. Chge.	Wght.	Rte. Chge.	Wght.	Rte. Chge.
Minimum,		16000	88	17920	88	20320	88
Excess,		3000	"	3000	"	3000	"
Total,		19000	"	20920	"	23320	"
Excess,		4000	"	4000	"	4000	"
Total,		20000	"	21920	"	24320	"
Excess,		5000	"	5000	"	5000	"
Total,		21000	"	22920	"	25320	"
From Indianapolis,		16000	88	17920	88	20320	88
Excess,		3000	235.5	3000	235.5	3000	235.5
Total,		4000	235.5	4000	235.5	4000	235.5
Excess,		4000	235.5	4000	235.5	4000	235.5
Total,		5000	235.5	5000	235.5	5000	235.5
Excess,		5000	235.5	5000	235.5	5000	235.5
Total,		5000	235.5	5000	235.5	5000	235.5

\$14.25

59.00

73.75

199.94

70.65

276.59

94.20

291.14

117.75

317.69

COMPARATIVE RATES SHOWING INEQUALITIES OPERATING AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS INTERESTS.

Vehicles—Part car lots in excess of full carloads.

To Little Rock, Arkansas.

Under Class A rating.

From	—36-ft Car—			—40-ft. Car—			—45-ft. Car—			—50-ft Car—		
	Wght.	Rte.	Chgo.	Wght.	Rte.	Chgo.	Wght.	Rte.	Chgo.	Wght.	Rte.	Chgo.
From												
St. Louis,	14000	35	49.00	15680	35	54.88	17780	35	62.23	19880	35	69.58
Indianapolis to E. St. Louis, C. & L.	14000	16	22.40	18200	16	29.12	19600	16	31.36	21000	16	33.60
Excess 3000 lbs.,	3000	30	9.00	3000	30	9.00	3000	30	9.00	3000	30	9.00
" 4000 "	1000	"	12.00	4000	"	12.00	1000	"	12.00	1000	"	12.00
" 5000 "	5000	"	15.00	5000	"	15.00	5000	"	15.00	5000	"	15.00
Beyond East St. Louis,												
Excess 3000 lbs.,	3000	150	15.00	3000	150	15.00	3000	150	15.00	3000	150	15.00
" 4000 "	1000	"	* 19.00	1000	"	* 19.00	1000	"	* 19.00	1000	"	* 19.00
" 5000 "	5000	"	* 19.00	5000	"	* 19.00	5000	"	* 19.00	5000	"	* 19.00
Total Charge from Indianapolis,												
Excess 3000 lbs.,			125.40			138.00			147.59			157.18
" 4000 "			132.40			145.00			151.59			164.18
" 5000 "			135.40			148.00			157.59			167.18

From	Minimum,			17780			19880		
	Chgo	Ind	Milw	Chgo	Ind	Milw	Chgo	Ind	Milw
Cincinnati	14000			15680			17780		
Chicago)	3000			3000			3000		
Milwaukee)	17000	41	71.80	18680	41	82.19	20780	41	94.43
	18000	"	79.20	19680	"	86.59	21780	"	95.83
	19000	"	83.60	20680	"	90.99	22780	"	100.33
							24880	"	109.17

*Carload charge for 36-ft. car.

Differences in favor of Cincinnati, Chicago and Milwaukee,

as against Indianapolis:

Length of Car,		40 ft.		45 ft.		50 ft.	
		Chgo	Ind	Chgo	Ind	Chgo	Ind
3000 Excess	50.60	55.81	56.16	56.31	56.31	56.31	56.31
1000 Excess	53.20	58.41	58.76	59.14	59.14	59.14	59.14
5000 Excess	51.80	57.01	57.36	57.71	57.71	57.71	57.71

To General Freight Agents, Indianapolis Roads:

DEAR SIR:—We enclose herewith Exhibits, our Sheets Nos. 25 to 48, inclusive, presenting further the inequalities and hardship imposed upon Indianapolis traffic under the existing unfair adjustment in our rates and unwarranted and prohibitive restrictions put upon shipments from here, which are not enforced on like traffic from our surrounding competitive points, as set forth in the exhibits.

We are clearly in the right in calling upon the initial carriers at this point to correct at once the abuses in rates complained of in their own tariff issues, and likewise to secure the relief asked for in the tariff publications of Western and Southwestern roads; also where we contend Indianapolis in certain respects is not assigned to properly defined territorial grouping; also the restrictions referred to on many of our important commodities as presented in the exhibits. These disabilities our interests here insist must be remedied without delay, and our traffic permitted to move under as free and favorable conditions as given to our competing cities. It is nothing less than outrageous that the differences in freight against Indianapolis, as shown in these exhibits, should be allowed to exist and argument is not required to establish that fact.

The exhibits herewith presented establish conclusively that Indianapolis both as to locality and industries is wantonly discriminated against and the situation demands that the carriers recognize our rights and cease such discrimination and adopt a just and relative basis in the reconstruction of Indianapolis rates as set forth in the exhibits.

We show that on furniture destined to the Missouri River points, Kansas City to Omaha, inclusive, and territory intermediate Indianapolis pays freight on car-load shipments, \$39.00 more than Louisville, \$49.00 more than Chicago on furniture not otherwise specified, while on Spring Beds, Metal Couch Frames, Metallic Mattresses, Cots and Cribs Indianapolis pays \$26.84 more than Louisville and \$36.84 more than Chicago on the same minimum weight basis as applied from these points.

Distances to Kansas City are: From Chicago, 458 miles; from Louisville, 552 miles, and from Indianapolis,

492 miles, Indianapolis being only 34 miles further than Chicago and 60 miles shorter mileage than Louisville. The average distance to the five Missouri River points, viz., Kansas City, Atchison, Leavenworth, St. Joseph and Omaha are: From Chicago 484, Louisville 596, Indianapolis 524, showing Indianapolis to be only 40 miles further than Chicago and 72 miles shorter than Louisville. Our Sheet No. 25.

We show that on Furniture destined to Missouri River and territory beyond from Michigan points the minimum weight is 12000 lbs. for any length of car on the basis of 3rd-class rate to the basing point, Chicago; while from Indianapolis on 50-ft. car, generally used for furniture, the minimum weight is 18000 lbs. and our rate is on the basis of 2nd-class as per Classification. Our traffic therefore is subjected to a double handicap in weight and rate and under these conditions Indianapolis pays freight \$17.00 per car more than Grand Rapids, \$14.00 per car more than Toledo, Detroit, Saginaw and Bay City, and \$22 per car more than Benton Harbor and Niles, Michigan. Distances to Kansas City are: From Bay City 763 miles, Detroit 713, Toledo 662, Grand Rapids 636, from Niles and Benton Harbor each 550, while from Indianapolis 492 miles. Sheets 26, 27 and 28.

We show that on chairs, carloads, destined to Missouri River points and intermediate territory, Indianapolis with distance as shown above decidedly in our favor, pays freight on 50-ft. cars \$12.00 to \$14.00 per car more than Grand Rapids, and \$4.00 per car more than Detroit, while competition with Chicago and Louisville we pay \$68.00 and \$58.00 per car, respectively, more than those points on the basis of same minimum weight.

In this connection attention is called to the fact that our natural and direct route, viz., via Mississippi River, is closed to us and the traffic forced to move via Chicago to obtain the lower rating which we do by using the Cincinnati to Chicago commodity rate on basis of 2nd class, being intermediate, while full classification rating of 1½ 1st class would apply routing direct via E. St. Louis or Mississippi River crossings as shown by exhibit. See our Sheets 29, 30 and 31.

We show that on furniture not otherwise specified destined to territory in Missouri and Kansas, basing on

Missouri River Crossings, the rates from Chicago are $24\frac{1}{2}$ c per cwt. less than from Indianapolis, and on the other kinds of furniture specified Chicago rates are 16c, $8\frac{1}{2}$ c and 6c per cwt. less than charged on Indianapolis shipments, and Grand Rapids and other Michigan points by reason of their low commodity rate to Chicago effect lower through rates than Indianapolis to the territory in question. Our Sheet No. 32 with list showing grouping of Missouri and Kansas points.

We show that on chairs, C. L., destined to St. Louis, Indianapolis pays a rate of $58\frac{1}{2}$ c per cwt., while Louisville pays 35c, Grand Rapids 50c, Detroit 55c and Chicago 23c. See our Sheet No. 43.

We show that on furniture, C. L., as specified in exhibit destined to points in Kentucky and Tennessee, shipments from St. Louis are taken on proportional rate of 17c, 4th class, E. St. Louis to Ohio River, while Indianapolis pays local rate on classification basis of 2nd class, viz., 22c per cwt. Distance from E. St. Louis 336 miles, from Indianapolis 110 miles. See our Sheet No. 44.

We show that part car lot in excess of full carload on certain specified commodities, destined to Texas and Arkansas points, are charged at L. C. L. rates on shipments from Indianapolis—while from Cincinnati, Louisville, New Albany, Evansville, Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Louis, these part car lots are given the carload rating. Our Sheets Nos. 47 and 48.

We show that shipments of vehicles, chairs, furniture and woodenware, destined to Arkansas common points from Indianapolis, are charged local rates to E. St. Louis, while the same commodities move from Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, Evansville, etc., on basis of differentials over E. St. Louis. Our Sheets Nos. 41 and 42.

We show that class and commodity rates to Indian and Oklahoma Territories from Indianapolis are held on Cincinnati basis, whereas by reason of distance and geography, we are entitled to Chicago rate basis. Our Sheets 33 to 40 inclusive, and 45 and 46.

The adjustments called for under these showings are as enumerated in attached sheets, and we urge there be no such delay on the part of the roads in correcting these wrongs as has been manifested so far in connection with

our exhibits previously presented. Sheets 1 to 24 inclusive.

Our members request an immediate expression of your views and attitude towards the relief to Indianapolis traffic indicated in these exhibits and accompanying letters submitted.

Very truly yours,

.....
Commissioner.

Oct. 29, 1906.

READJUSTMENTS IN RATES AND CONDITIONS ASKED FOR REMOV-
ING DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS TRAFFIC, AS
PER EXHIBITS—SHEETS NUMBERED 25 TO 48 INCLUSIVE.

1st.—That rates on furniture, C. L., all kinds from Indianapolis to Missouri River Crossings and intermediate territory be adjusted and authorized on basis of 5c per cwt. over Chicago rates on basis of 20,000 lbs. minimum for any length of car—same as applies from Chicago and Louisville, shown in Exhibit, Sheet No. 25.

2nd.—That on furniture, all kinds, carloads, destined to Missouri River and points beyond in Missouri and Kansas, as per lists of group points attached to exhibit, rates from Indianapolis be established and published on basis of 5c per cwt. above the Chicago rates with minimum weight 20,000 lbs. for any length car—Sheets 26, 27, 28 and 32.

3rd.—That rates on chairs, carloads, as described in exhibit, from Indianapolis destined to Missouri River points and intermediate territory be established and published on basis of 5c per cwt. above the Chicago rates under Western Classification minimum weights, observing as maximum basis the 30c rate at 20,000 lbs. from Chicago—Sheets 29, 30 and 31.

4th.—That class and commodity rates from Indianapolis to Indian and Oklahoma Territories, covered in I. & O. Committee Tariff I-II, be readjusted on a lower basis, by including Indianapolis in Chicago group territory and applying Chicago rates. This is amply justified on the grounds of geographical position and comparative dis-

tances. Taking McAlester as a fairly central point in Indian Territory and Oklahoma City for that territory:

Chicago to McAlester, 774 miles, from Indianapolis 808 miles, while Cincinnati is 902 miles.

Chicago to Oklahoma City is 802 miles, from Indianapolis 785 miles, while Cincinnati is 879 miles.

The average distance from Chicago is 784 miles, from Indianapolis 796, while from Cincinnati 890 miles.

Being shorter mileage in one instance and but 12 miles difference on average distance entitles Indianapolis to Chicago rates asked for. See our Sheets 33 to 40 inclusive, and 45 and 46.

5th.—That on traffic from Indianapolis destined to Arkansas common points, where differential basis over E. St. Louis is used in effecting through rates, the carriers abolish and remove the restrictions imposed upon certain commodities important among our industries, including vehicles, woodenware, furniture and chairs under which the differential basis is denied to our shipments and local rates to E. St. Louis charged resulting in very great hardship absolutely prohibitive to Indianapolis interests, especially so since these commodities move on the differential basis from Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, Evansville, etc. The figures presented in exhibit and in letter to Indianapolis Committee show the outrage imposed upon Indianapolis interests. Sheets 41 and 42.

6th.—That on chairs, C. L., destined to St. Louis, a rate from Indianapolis be established on basis of 2d-class 32c per cwt., this being the basis of commodity rates between other C. F. A. points, shown in exhibit, our Sheet No. 43.

7th.—That on furniture, C. L., as specified in exhibit destined to interior Kentucky and Tennessee points, shipments from Indianapolis be given 4th-class proportional rate to Ohio River Crossings, same basis as in effect from St. Louis. Our Sheet No. 44.

8th.—That on shipments of vehicles or other bulky articles, destined to Texas and Arkansas points, where there is a part car lot in excess of full carload, the restriction enforced on such part lots, under which L. C. L. rating is charged, be removed and permit the carload rate to apply, same as allowed on similar part lot excess shipments from Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Cincinnati,

Louisville, New Albany, Evansville and other points. The extra freight on Indianapolis traffic under the ruling complained of is a severe restraint on trade, prohibiting sales in many instances by reason of these additional, excessive and unjust charges shown in exhibit, Sheets 17 and 18.

The foregoing must impress the reader, that the cases are not so few nor isolated. On the contrary, our traffic to practically all parts of the country, excepting between here and the North Atlantic Seaboard, is subject to excessive rates and unjust conditions which are not enforced against traffic from competitive cities and districts.

Note the extent of territory covered in exhibits: from the Carolinas throughout the Southeast and South, Mississippi Valley, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Indian and Oklahoma Territories, Missouri River points, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Utah, St. Paul, Minneapolis, etc. Mr. Grammer knows all this, yet tells us it is not so, or that only here and there a little difference exists. Note the exhibits and then measure his misstatements.

Again, he says that where such cases do exist the initial roads in Indiana are powerless to protect their local industries. That statement is unwarranted, since the initial roads have it in their own hands to solve the conditions complained of. Take traffic for points in Southeast territory, as shown on Exhibits, Sheets 7 to 11, inclusive, where *St. Louis can ship right through Indianapolis via Cincinnati at rates about the same and in some cases lower than the rates from Indianapolis.* The rates beyond Cincinnati are just the same and the differences complained of are all in the rates this side of the river. Is there anything to prevent the roads, Indianapolis to Cincinnati, in adjusting their own rates so as to give Indianapolis interests a chance to compete with St. Louis? It is absurd to say they cannot.

Take traffic destined to Memphis, New Orleans, etc., Sheets 1, 2 and 3. Is there any justice in hauling freight *from Chicago and from Cincinnati right through Indianapolis at rates lower than charged from Indianapolis?* And would the gentleman say the roads passing through here from Chicago and from Cincinnati with that traffic are powerless to adjust the rates from Indianapolis?

Look at Sheet 44. Does there appear anything to prevent the roads from Indianapolis to Cincinnati and Louisville making rates to correspond with the rates from St. Louis?

Refer to Sheets 41 and 42, showing how we get to Arkansas with some of our principal commodities as against Cincinnati and Louisville, *paying from Indianapolis to St. Louis twice and three times the rates charged from Cincinnati and Louisville, while the traffic from those points passes right through Indianapolis.*

Sheet No. 43 shows that on chairs in *carloads*, our manufacturers and shippers are obliged to pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ times first-class rate, while competitors at other points are favored with 2nd-class and 4th-class rates. In other words, Chicago to St. Louis, distance 280 miles, has rate of 23c per cwt., as against Indianapolis, 242 miles, rate $58\frac{1}{2}$ c; and Detroit and Grand Rapids with double the distance have lower rates than Indianapolis.

The initial Indiana roads, if they so desired, could take action to remedy the conditions complained of, and it is mere idle talk to say they have no voice in the protection of the industrial and commercial interests in Indiana and are powerless to change the situation. Were they to direct some of the energy towards helping their local industries which they are expending in resisting the measures of relief asked for, the burdens complained of could easily be removed. The same general principle applies throughout the exhibits on traffic destined beyond the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and the initial Indiana roads could effect the needed adjustment in these competitive conditions without disturbing or affecting their local rates for intermediate traffic. Mr. Grammer knows how true all this is and it would be interesting to have him explain why the initial roads are unwilling to give Indianapolis and *the other interior Indiana cities* a fair relative basis for competitive traffic.

Refer again to exhibits, Sheets 4 and 5 and 43, and note *the favoritism shown to Michigan interests*:

On Furniture	they have 3rd class rates—we pay 2nd class.
“ Woodenware	“ “ 6th “ “ “ “ 4th “
“ Varnish	“ “ 5th “ “ “ “ 4th “
“ Chairs	“ “ 2nd “ “ “ “ $1\frac{1}{2}$ 1st class.
“ Stoves	“ “ 6th “ “ “ “ 5th class.

Why is this? And will Mr. Grammer tell us that his system of roads, operating lines in both states, cannot give Indiana interests the same classification basis as like interests in Michigan enjoy? Look at the exhibit for Furniture, Sheets 25 to 32, inclusive, and note that to Kansas City the freight is \$49.00 per car more from Indianapolis than from Chicago, and \$39.00 per car more than from Louisville; the distance is only 30 miles in favor of Chicago, while Louisville is 70 miles farther than Indianapolis. Note that Grand Rapids, Detroit and Bay City, Mich., can ship furniture to Kansas City and the other Missouri River points cheaper than Indianapolis with distances 150 to 200 miles in favor of Indianapolis. Further, our shippers of chairs have to pay \$68.00 per car more than Chicago and \$58.00 more than Louisville to Kansas City, and the other Missouri River points; also Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich., pay less freight than Indianapolis, and the same differences in freight applies to shipments to points beyond the Missouri River crossings in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado and Utah. Does such adjustment of rates appeal to Mr. Grammer as being fair? Are these cases what he terms "petty" ones? Are these rates charged only a "little higher" as he expresses it? He tells us there is no relief, i. e., the initial roads are unwilling to grant relief; so that while these same roads can readily adjust their rate conditions on traffic from Ohio River points, Chicago and territory lying west of the Indiana-Illinois state line, where they have the *competition of Southern and Western roads not controlled by the Central Freight Association*, when it comes to treating with shipping interests located in *interior Indiana* the screws are set and they declare they are powerless to act.

To whom, then, are the manufacturers and shippers of interior Indiana to look for relief?

Must we appeal to the outside roads, in the west and south, to regulate Indiana rates?

Are there no obligations resting upon the Indiana railroads under their charters to interest themselves in protecting local industries in this state by adjusting rates on a relative basis to those in effect from surrounding competitive districts?

Can our industrial and commercial interests prosper against such discriminations as pointed out in the foregoing exhibits?

The only alternative indicated by the declaration of Mr. Grammer would point to the removal of manufacturing and jobbing interests to the *more favored cities and districts*, where the carriers are not so *powerless* or indifferent and where they would exert their influence in sympathy with the needs of traffic.

What could be more disquieting or injure so much the relations between shipper and carrier than to listen to a speech, from a man holding high official station and clothed with the authority held by Mr. Grammer, so marked by misstatements, vainly attempting to deny existing conditions which have been clearly and forcibly presented with the full understanding and approval of the members of this Bureau.

INDIANAPOLIS FREIGHT BUREAU.

J. KEAVY, *Commissioner*.

Approved by Executive Committee of Directors.

December, 1906.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- T. R. KACKLEY, Atlas Engine Works
 H. BATES, JR., American Hominy Co.
 H. C. ATKINS, E. C. Atkins & Co.
 J. L. KETCHAM, Brown-Ketcham Iron Works
 HARRY B. GATES, Climax Coffee & Baking Powder Co.
 W. M. TAYLOR, Chandler & Taylor Co.
 F. B. WHITLOCK, Indianapolis Foundry Co.
 C. C. HANCH, Nerdylke & Marmen Co.
 ALBERT LIEBER, Indianapolis Brewing Co.
 SAMUEL REID, Kingan & Co., Ltd.
 T. B. LAYCOCK, The T. B. Laycock Mfg. Co.
 C. P. McDOUGAL, G. P. McDougal & Son.
 W. G. GRIFFITH, National Malleable Castings Co.
 D. M. PARRY, Parry Mfg. Co.
 CORTLAND VAN CAMP, Van Camp Hardware & Iron Co.
 H. H. RICE, Pope Motor Car Co.
 GEORGE G. GRIFFIN, Schnull & Co.
 ROBERT ELLIOTT, Standard Dry Kiln Co.
 H. O. SMITH, Indianapolis Rubber Co.
 E. HAVENS, Havens & Geddes Co.
 P. H. CLIFFORD, C. P. Lesh Paper Co.

A D D E N D A

Attention is called to the fact that a considerable portion of Mr. Grammer's discourse consists of what appears to be "Stock Arguments" of the railroads, used generally, in all sections of the country, as the following would seem to indicate:

Mr. Grammer's Speech at Indianapolis, Nov. 19th, 1906.

(Page 17.)

As before stated, Indiana was no exception. Its general charters and statutes granted in response to the sentiments of the people, make a history of public aid and encouragement to the builders of railroads, and contain no hint of antagonistic public sentiment, or of an ultimate purpose of severe or drastic public control or injury.

(Page 17.)

While public and governmental assistance was, in due course, forthcoming, with liberal exemption from governmental interference in the management of such properties, yet there were very few railroad enterprises in Indiana that were able to maintain themselves during their early history, which is replete with bankruptcy and disaster, and have only been able to escape complete annihilation through the amalgamation of the weak and disjointed properties, thereby affording continuous transportation.

Speech of Samuel Spencer, at Montgomery, Ala., Oct. 25th, 1906.

Alabama was no exception to this rule of governmental encouragement. Its general statutes and the charters granted by its General Assembly in response to the sentiments of its people, make a history of public aid and encouragement to the building of railroads, and contain no hint of antagonistic public sentiment or of an ultimate purpose of severe or drastic public control or injury.

But notwithstanding the public and governmental favor thus extended—notwithstanding the substantial freedom from governmental interference in their management—there were very few railroad enterprises in the South which could at first maintain themselves. The history of many of them was a history of bankruptcy and disaster until the weak and disjointed properties were amalgamated so as to afford continuous transportation.

Mr. Grammer—Nov. 19, 1906.
(Pages 17-18.)

While the public and the properties have been greatly benefited by such amalgamation, which brought about certain power over the interests of commodities, localities and persons, yet the demands made upon the facilities thus afforded have not always been based on sound reason, the public character of the enterprises being practically all that has received recognition or consideration, the private rights of the owners having been, to all intents and purposes, completely lost sight of in the swinging of the pendulum from the extreme on one side to the extreme on the other.

(Pages 17-18.)

Justice is what might be termed "the happy medium," lying as it does between the two extremes. Faithful performance of public duties by the owners of these properties, without fear or favor for any interests, should rigidly obtain, in which event the residuum is on a parity with and entitled to the same consideration as all other private property.

(Page 18.)

We should remember that the transportation properties were fostered upon the assumption that they would be granted not only reasonable public countenance, but the natural support under which such powers were conferred, thereby stimulating private investment.

Mr. Spencer—Oct. 25, 1906.

With that amalgamation of properties and its consequent public good, came great power exaggerated perhaps in the public mind—but still great power, over the interests of commodities, localities and persons, and with it a demand for public regulation. It must be admitted that this demand, within just and reasonable limits, is based on sound reason. In the progress of time, the public aspect of this question has become entirely reversed. The pendulum has swung from an extreme on the one side to an extreme on the other. As, in the inception of railroad construction, the public relations of the properties were largely lost sight of, so now, in reaction, the public character of the enterprises is almost the only thing recognized or considered, and the private rights of the owners are, in the political thought of the day, almost if not entirely forgotten.

Justice, however, lies between the two extremes. These properties and their owners should be required to perform faithfully their public duties under reasonable rates and practices, under full publicity without unjust discrimination and without favor for any interests. When this obligation is performed, the residuum is private property entitled to the same consideration and protection at the hands of the public and of the government as all other private property.

In the formation of public policies, common justice requires us to remember that when these properties were originally created, it was done in reliance on the good faith of that reasonable public countenance and support under which the public powers were granted and the private investments were made.

Mr. Grammer—Nov. 19, 1906.

(Page 18.)

The obstacles, hindrances and perplexities with which the railroad manager of today is confronted, become more clearly manifest when we consider the dual nature of his labors in administering property in which investments of a private nature have been made, yet is charged with public duties of importance. It is necessary that he furnish proper facilities to the public at reasonable rates, avoid all unjust discrimination as between commodities or persons or localities, and see that his patrons receive equal and impartial treatment, exact justice being his keynote of action.

(Pages 19-20.)

The handicaps that have been fixed upon the railroads incident to hurried preparations and overtaxed facilities, have, in a measure, deprived the carriers of a sympathy that would otherwise be accorded them, had not this unnecessary and unwarranted course been decided upon by those who know how to appeal to a popular misunderstanding.

(Pages 19-20.)

It is preached from coast to coast that railroads are in possession of wealth untold and resources unlimited, and this doctrine, spread by the demagogue, has made these corporations the target of every mushroom candidate for popular favor. The result is that the average citizen of the United States is possessed of a desperate desire to weigh the rights of railroads in a different scale than that which would be employed in dealing out a fair and judicial decision where the rights of any other public utility might have been questioned. The idea seems to have become prevalent among those who are supposed to sit

Mr. Spencer—Oct. 25, 1906.

Confronted by this evolution—or, rather, by this revolution—of conditions, with the administration of a property of dual nature, invested in as a private concern, but charged with important public duties, the difficulties of the railroad manager become apparent. On the one hand is his imperative obligation to the public to provide for it proper facilities, to do so at reasonable rates, to avoid all unjust discriminations as between commodities or persons or localities, and to do equal and exact justice as between his patrons.

This fact and the shortcomings necessarily incident to hurried preparations, and overtaxed facilities, have largely deprived these carriers of popular sympathy, and subjected them to easy misrepresentations and to popular misunderstanding.

The outward expression of size and power has impressed the popular mind with the idea that they possess untold wealth and limitless resources. It made them the easy mark of the political agitator. The result has been that there has crept into the public mind a different standard of justice for them from that which governs the property rights of every individual property holder in the land. Statutes have been enacted establishing principles of liability of a railroad company which do not apply in the case of the farmer, the mill owner or the employer in any other department of industry. Juries have come to think it right to award verdicts

Mr. Grammer—Nov. 19, 1906.

upon the bench, that railroads are legitimate prey, and that they must pay a higher price for their shortcomings than the individual who may have inadvertently damaged the property of their neighbor.

(Page 22.)

The universal increase in the price of labor is so obvious in its application to every industry that it is hardly necessary to refer to it as a factor in this case. While the railroads are subject to the same demands as other industries, they suffer a disadvantage which is not sustained by any other industry; the law prohibiting the carrier from owning any assets not directly necessary to the proper conduct of its business.

(Pages 22-23.)

It is an indisputable fact that a different law governs the railroads than that under which the tiller of the soil, the industrial magnate and the merchant conduct their varied enterprises, the latter trio regulating their prices by the cost of the product they have to sell, but not so with the railroads, which have only one article which can be sold to the public, viz., transportation, and now there is a hysterical clamor for measures that will compel the railroads to maintain at any and all times and under all circumstances, the same charge for their services.

(Pages 22-23.)

Coincident with the increases in the operating expenses there has been a corresponding decrease in the rates, and at the present time, when the cost of transportation is the smallest item in the cost of any article consumed by the public, the great hue and cry of the agitator and demagogue is for the greater reduction in railroad revenue.

Mr. Spencer—Oct. 25, 1906.

for larger damages against railroad corporations than against individual litigants.

I need not call your attention to the increase in the price of labor. It applies to every industry, and the railways are not only not exempt, but they suffer the great disadvantage not shared by others that increased prosperity of the country and activity in business does not bring to them increased prices for the only article they have for sale—transportation.

The farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, when paying higher wages or higher prices for raw material, obtains as a rule, a higher price for his products.

Not so with the carrier. He must, under stress of market competition and the inexorable decree of public sentiment, keep the prices for his product-transportation at the same or at lower figures.

Coupled with these increased expenses, there has been a constant reduction in rates, and to-day the percentage contributed by transportation rates to the cost of whatever the people consume is much smaller than ever before in history, and smaller in America than in any other country of the world. And yet the loudest cry that is heard to-day from the public voice, and the most persistent demand from every quarter, is for an enforced reduction in railway charges.

Mr. Grammer, Nov. 19, 1906.
(Pages 20-21.)

Considering the increase in the cost of everything for which the carrier must pay, without account for the damage suits and taxes that are daily assessed against them, it is hardly justifiable to assume that a commensurate decrease in its earnings will not have its effect, and I take it that you will agree with me that ultimately there must be a point reached where the carrier can no longer supply the public demand, unless you destroy, by some means, the law of barter and exchange. It must be apparent to you that if there is a continual increase in the units of expense, with a commensurate decrease in the units of revenue, the financial strength of the enterprise cannot survive indefinitely, and meet the traffic demands of the public, and if the process is carried far enough, there is no power that will avert a national calamity, which years of experience cannot restore.

(Pages 25-26.)

The carriers should not be denounced because of a few individual grievances; the narrow spirit of condemnation should not be allowed to warp the larger spirit of justice, and every fair-minded person must recognize, and cannot but admit, that the service rendered has been satisfactory, on the whole.

(Page 26-27.)

As heretofore stated, the interests of the railroad and of its patrons are so closely interwoven that one cannot prosper without the other. The railroads must do justice to the public and the public must do justice to the railroad. They must work together and their co-operation is absolutely essential to each other's success which is the general public welfare, and anyone who would wantonly promote strife

Mr. Spencer—Oct. 25, 1906.

With an increase in the price of everything the carrier must buy, with an increase in the cost of labor, of materials, in the verdicts of juries in damage suits, in taxes, and with decreasing rates, a point must ultimately be reached where the carrier's capacity to meet the public demand for increased facilities must be substantially impaired, if not destroyed. It must be apparent that if there is a continual increase in the units of expense, with a continual decrease in the units of revenue, the financial strength of the enterprise cannot survive indefinitely. If the progress is carried far enough, more increase in volume of traffic which has sustained the carriers thus far will not suffice, and without financial strength and credit the carrier cannot adequately meet the proper requirements of the public.

I appeal from the narrow spirit which condemns because of a few individual grievances and exceptional deficiencies to the larger spirit of justice of the people, which will recognize that the true standard of enlightened judgment must be the fidelity and efficiency with which the service as a whole has been rendered.

The interests of the railroad and of its patrons are identical. One cannot prosper without the other. The railroad must do justice to the people. The people should do justice to the railroad. Their cordial co-operation in the great field of human industry is essential to the public welfare. They must work together in a spirit of forbearance and mutual consideration and trust if they are to accomplish the results for which both are striving.

Mr. Grammer, Nov. 19, 1906.

between them or cause dissension, is a public enemy, and it must be borne in mind that disaster once precipitated is irreparable and will reflect itself upon the fortunes of the people long after its disturbing cause has ceased to be a factor. You must also bear in mind that the railroad which does not develop and encourage traffic cannot maintain itself, and the patrons of the railway will be the first to feel the disastrous effects of such failure.

Mr. Spencer—Oct. 25, 1906.

and which are within their grasp if they work together.

The man who would sow dissension between them and embarrass their co-operation by misunderstandings, friction and antagonism is a public enemy. While the railroads may be in a sense at his mercy, he should not be tolerated by the people, for the oppression he seeks to bring upon the railroad must reflect itself upon the fortunes of the people long after the disturbing cause has been forgotten. The cardinal point to be appreciated and remembered is that a railroad will destroy itself unless it fosters traffic, unless it adopts such a policy toward its patrons as will encourage and increase permanently the movement of business. On the other hand, the people will be the first and the greatest sufferers if by hostile action they limit the capacity of the railroads to serve them.





3 0112 062004368